The Journal of Historical Review

Volume Two, Number Four **Winter 1981**

EDITOR
THOMAS J. MARCELLUS

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DR. WALTER BEVERAGGI ALLENDE
UNIVERSITY OF BUENOS AIRES, Buenos Aires

DR. AUSTIN J. APP
LA SALLE COLLEGE, Philadelphia (Ret.)

JOHN BENNETT
VICTORIAN COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES
Melbourne, Australia

DR. REINHARD K. BUCHNER
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, Long Beach

DR. ARTHUR R. BUTZ
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, Evanston

DR. ROBERT FAURISSON
UNIVERSITY OF LYON-2, Lyon, France

DITLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine, Täby, Sweden

PERCY L. GREAVES JR.
Free Market Economist

THOMAS HENRY IRWIN
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
The New Libertarian, Long Beach

DR. MARTIN A. LARSON
The Spotlight, Washington D.C.

DR. JAMES J. MARTIN
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

DR. REVILO P. OLIVER
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Urbana

DR. WILHELM STÄGLICH
Retired Judge, West Germany

UDO WALENDY
VERLAG FÜR VOLKSTUM & ZEITGESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

DR. CHARLES E. WEBER
UNIVERSITY OF TULSA, Oklahoma

DR. ANDREAS R. WESSERLE
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY, Milwaukee (Ret.)

The Journal of Historical Review is published quarterly by the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription prices are as follows: One year, U.S.$20; two years, U.S.$35; three years, U.S.$50—or the equivalent in foreign currency. Foreign subscribers should add U.S.$5 if paying with a remittance drawn on a foreign bank. For domestic First Class delivery add $5 per year. For Overseas Air Mail add U.S.$12 per year. Bulk subscription rates are available on request. Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor, but must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
Encyclopedia of Associations
Writers Market 1981
PTLA Catalog

ISSN: 0195-6752

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, U.S.A.

Permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made prior to off-printing, and also providing that the following attribution appears with the article:

"Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription rate: U.S.$20 per year."

Two copies of each off-print should be submitted to the Editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

In Memoriam

MABEL ELSABE NARJES

A great fighter for historical truth, Mabel Elsabe Narjes, has passed on. Fluent in English and French, as well as a master stylist in her native German, she produced many superbly well-crafted and lucid translations of important historical works into German.

Frau Narjes was responsible for the translation of Prof. David Hoggan's masterwork, *Der Erzwungene Krieg*. The 900-page study unleashed a great debate in Germany about the origins of the Second World War and is still the standard work on the war guilt question. She also translated Benjamin Colby's *'Twas a Famous Victory* and portions of Dr. Arthur Butz's *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* into German. Not long before her death, she translated *The Spotlight* newspaper reprint of "The Great Holocaust Debate" and was able to witness its enthusiastic reception in Germany.

She worked closely with many of the great historical pioneers of her age. She had the honor of introducing two of them—Paul Rassinier, a good friend, and the great American historian Harry Elmer Barnes—to each other personally in Europe.

She attended the 1980 convention of the Institute for Historical Review where she received well-deserved recognition of her years of devoted work. All those who met Frau Narjes were impressed by her sharp intellect and extraordinary spirit.

Following the catastrophic defeat of her nation in 1945, many embittered Germans passively tolerated the flood of lies and calumnies which characterized the historical "re-education" campaign imposed by the victorious powers. But not Mabel Narjes. From the early 1950s until her death in September, just before her 67th birthday, she remained a fanatic fighter against the falsifiers and manipulators of history. Linguistically at home in the three great languages of the continent, her work was a living expression of loyalty to both her native Germany and to European culture.

Mabel Narjes is dead. But she will live on in the hearts of those who honor her memory and in her inspired work among lovers of historical truth everywhere.

—Mark Weber
12 September 1981

CONTENTS

Correspondence 293

The Burning of Saint Malo 301
Philip Beck

Rassinier to the 'Nation' 305
Dr. Paul Rassinier

The Gas Chambers of Auschwitz
Appear to be Inconceivable 311
Dr. Robert Faurisson

The Gas Chambers: Truth or Lie? 319
Dr. Robert Faurisson/Storia Illustrada

The Miracle of Dunkirk Reconsidered 375
Charles Lutton

Bombs on Britain 381
Dr. Andreas Wesserle

About the Contributors (Inside back cover)

A Note From The Editor

Placing his career and personal safety on the line, Dr. Robert Faurisson of France has pursued the forbidden facts whose time have come.

His research has been brought to light in the U.S., of course, via *The Journal of Historical Review*. In Europe, though, his views are gaining broader notoriety as a result of a series of recent court judgements aimed at stopping him, his work, and any other Frenchman who might become similarly curious about the "gas chambers," "six-million," and associated documentary incredibilities.

Professor Faurisson was "summoned to court" for uttering the unthinkable; where the careful, objective scrutiny of his facts—the basis of his so-called "injurious views"— was strictly prohibited.

Nor was the more fundamental issue of freedom of expression considered. Just frenzy in the courtroom—lynch mentality.

His "crime" was to have revealed some answers, unconfrontable by an element which found it far easier to debase law in order to silence him. Thus similar now to Germany and inchoate elsewhere, criticism of exterminationist theory or related phenomena, in France, is compounded into the capital transgression of the age. Justice and "Holocaust" would seem to make strange bedfellows, but that is precisely the size of it.

This issue is dedicated to a courageous Robert Faurisson who now has no choice but to fight to regain what have been plundered from him: his rights to observe and evaluate, to have a view, to speak and write over the views of others, and to act. His two articles herein contain much of the data with which he is so intimate, and to which his adversaries attached criminal significance, then hurled back at him with an almost unprecedented vengeance.

In pursuit of the responsibility to clarify the historical record—and for which we owe him an indescribable debt of gratitude—Dr. Faurisson has come up against a monomaniacal *will-to-believe*; that overwhelming compulsion to assign actuality to events which are only *said* to have happened during the last great war, as well as allegedly similarly down through the ages.

Who are the persecutors here? Indeed, do the tracks of history tell a *far different* story than the one so vehemently promoted and unqualifiedly received? In any case, there is reason to be concerned. For in the search and dissemination of what new discoveries can be made, the booby-trap *in law* is a mighty effective deterrent.

Correspondence

Dear Editor: 2 February 1981

Having read Dr. Stein's article in the last (winter) issue of *The JHR*, I felt compelled to inform you, that, although the article was informative, I do hope that *The Journal's* trend will not be in that direction. One apology is quite sufficient; for to continue in that direction will mean to apologize the entire period of World War II into history.

I don't want the events of World War II apologized or psychoanalyzed into history! In your supplement to the *Journal*, you state that future issues will cover the work of "psycho-historians and anti-statist libertarians." Does this mean that I will be reading more about fantasy's relationship to reality, penis envy ("Germany's virility," a "feminized" France), and all of the rest of that good Freudian stuff? Does this mean that I get to read how communism, capitalism, fascism, naziism, and all other ism's are the same? Please, if I want to read *Commentary* or *The American Spectator*, I'll buy one!

The Journal of Historical Review has found its niche in the publishing world; that is, to reconstruct past events (principally of World War II), so that the reader can arm himself with the greatest of literary weapons—truth!

Dr. Stein doesn't give the reader the whole truth. He passes over events without explaining *why* they occurred. Example: the Jewish expulsion from Spain during the Christian *reconquista* from the Moors was presaged by the known collaboration between Jews and Moors; the uprising of the Ukrainian peasants in 1648, led by Bogdan Chmielnicki, was induced by their exploiters—the ruling class Poles and the Jews. Chmielnicki's famous outcry was: "Remember the insults of the Poles and the Jews, their favorite stewards and agents!" Under Hitler, national socialism's ascribed enemy was communism; and since most Jews were partial towards communism, and therefore opponents of the Nazis, most of them, as well as the communists, were interned in concentration camps.

Ezio M. Maiolini
Oakland, CA.

***

Dear Mr. Brandon: 11 February 1981

Dr. Howard F. Stein's courageous article "The Holocaust, and the Myth of the Past as History" (winter 1981) is by far the most significant exposition of this subject ever written by a Jewish social scientist and should be must reading for every American; Jew or Gentile. If read in conjuction with Dr. Stein's "American Judaism, Israel and the New Ethnicity" and "The Binding of the Son: Psychoanalytic Reflections on the Symbiosis of Anti-Semitism and Anti-Gentilism" the whole tragic history of Jewish-Gentile relations is devastatingly illuminated.

Over two decades ago, in a remarkable series of historical novels (1943-1960) Vardis Fisher, using the methods of psychohistory, deline-

ated the damaging effects inherent in the Judaeo-Christian mythology. Dr. Stein's work is a further elucidation of Fisher's 12-volume *Testament of Man* series.

Most Revisionist historians and publicists would reject the strictly "psychohistorical" approach because in their general theory the psychohistorians maintain that it is not the external facts—called economics, politics, and the like—and the social mores in general, which must be treated and perhaps revolutionized, but it is man himself and his familial relationships which must be treated. But these psychoneurotic drives are merely *effects* and *symptoms* of a disordered society, as most Revisionists steeped in the tradition of Lawrence Dennis, C.H. Douglas and Laurance Labadie realize. The chief exceptions to this would be the so-called exponents of Austrian "free market" economics which, in reality is only partially free. It is interesting that Harry Elmer Barnes was most sympathetic to the ideas of C.H. Douglas.

Notwithstanding the above reservations on the psychohistorical approach (several volumes could be written on the subject) Professor Stein has completely demolished the Holocaust mythology. It remains for us to dot the "i"s and cross the "t"s.

Sincerely,

Bezalel Chaim
Revisionist Press
GPO Box 2009
Brooklyn, NY 11202

***

Dear Lewis: 13 April 1981

I am pleased to respond to the letters by Sandra Ross and Wayland D. Smith published in Vol. 2, Nol 2 of *The JHR*. They illustrate, it seems to me, two distinct attitudes and genres in the current "re-vision" of the Holocaust and Jewish history. The first, exemplified by Smith, is that of "exposé." Ross succinctly summarizes contributions by Gonen and Hazleton, then proposes an intriguing schematic—one whose universal human developmental and psychodynamic themes every tribe, nation, and group must deal with in its political-historical activities and evolution. Smith seems to be starting out with a premise for which he seeks substantiation. Monolithic theory-building and ideological thinking that underlies it ought not be construed as peculiarly Jewish (although, lamentable, given the unbridled latitude of the imagination, one can construe anything as he desires it). Rather, such reified systems of thought that impose themselves projectively upon the world, only then to be "confirmed" spuriously by perception, takes us to the heart of culture itself, primitive and "modern." Smith misplaces the ancestry of psychohistory; in its excesses, psychohistory, like all forms of intellectualism, is profoundly human, not reductionistically Jewish. "Seek what ye wish to find" is the unacknowledged "first commandment" of the human search for security. One might respond to Smith's observation about the faddishness of psychohistory with a simplistic *tu quoque* about

sociobiology. But that would miss altogether the important point that *how we use our theories, and to what out-of-awareness ends,* determines whether that activity is science or ideology. Precisely because we are often committed to a particular model by which we organize our thinking, we are given to criticize another's epistemology as faddish while giving obeisance to our own which we mistake for absolute truth (a statement which I stringently apply to myself!). I frankly worry about the zeal with which much current re-vision of Judaism and the Holocaust is undertaken. It is though the party-line taboo on re-examining Jewish history and the Holocaust is now being broken with a desire to discredit, even condemn, previous scholarship and Jews who are the subject of this scholarship. I would urge all my colleagues to examine their motives for the research they choose as stringently as they analyze their data—for we are, everywhere and always, part of our data. We need to ask ourselves: "Why do I need to disprove this particular myth (and not some other)?" Perhaps not so oddly, a hypertrophied fascination with Jews—or with any group—reveals much about the investigator, and thereby distorts the findings. What I find lacking in much current behavioral science (not Revisionism alone) is an identification with, an empathy for, the group being interpreted: explanation is not the same as blame. And it is the former which I have attempted in my *JHR* paper. I heartily commend to the reader three additional works: two papers on Judaism and psychohistory, by Jay Gonen, in the Fall 1978 and Winter 1970 issues of *The Journal of Psychohistory*; and a recent book by Jacob Neusner, *Stranger at Home; 'The Holocaust,' Zionism, and American Judaism* (University of Chicago Press).

I offer these comments in the spirit of continuing dialogue, and thank Sandra Ross and Wayland D. Smith for their comments.

Sincerely,

Howard F. Stein, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
University of Oklahoma

***

Dear Lewis: 4 September 1980

All I can say is "What is this?" is regards to your book review of *Oradour: Village of the Dead* by Philip Beck (Fall 1980 issue, page 276). Ach, you of all people should swallow such a thing? I thought you were the driving force behind the "Historical Revisionism" movement in North America!

I have done considerable reading from all angles on "Oradour" and Philip Beck's book sounds like the standard French diatribe on the subject. Many of the events he mentioned *could not* and did not happen as outlined.

Working from mostly German eye-witness accounts and reports (totally ignored by the other side), and from *Kameraden bis zum Ende* (the Regimental history of "Der Führer" by Otto Weidinger) I compiled a correct account of "Oradour" which appeared in the September 1980

issue of *Siegrunen* ($7.50/year; Box 70, Mt. Reuben Road, Glendale, OR 97442).

Weidinger assumed command of "Der Führer" soon after Oradour, and also happens to be a vigorous supporter of *Siegrunen*.

The rest of the Fall 1980 issue was great; the letters section happily confirming my own hostility against modern "academics." Let me say that I whole-heartedly concur with the sentiment in your last sentence of your "Oradour" review, but you sure as heck won't realize it through Beck's book!

Sincerely,

Richard Landwehr
Glendale, OR

***

Dear Mr. Brandon: 19 February 1981

Having read Herr Landwehr's article on Oradour in *Siegrunen* I think I am justified in commenting on it as well as on his letter.

The article contains a number of fantastic falsehoods which must surely throw considerable doubt on the whole SS version of the massacre. For example, it is obvious that, unlike me, the writer has never visited the ruins, otherwise he would have seen the bullet-pocked ruins of the garages and barns in which the men were shot and would not repeat the lie that they were "taken into a nearby farm field and shot."

His story of the exploding houses and above all the events in the church must be regarded as purely and wickedly imaginative. He writes in the article: ". . . a tremendous blast literally tore off the top of the church and engulfed the building in a wall of flame. The church attic had also been used for (munitions) storage . . ."

I suggest he reads my book and then goes to Oradour to get the record straight. I have examined the interior and exterior of the church and could find no evidence of a big explosion. There is however evidence of the grenades and bullets used by the SS to finish off the women and children. The "attic" must be the one containing the bells in the tower. If there had been an explosion there they would have come down intact. In fact, the tower became a chimney for the pyre created by the SS to burn the dead and dying women and children and the bells came down in a mass of molten metal which can still be seen at the base of the tower inside the church. The church burned easily because of the large area of woodwork in the roof.

Herr Landwehr implies that the women and children were sitting on a mass of explosives—a likely addition to the decorations which had been put up for the First Communion to be celebrated the next day! And if he really believes that these innocent people died solely because the folly of storing munitions in the church, he must dismiss the story of the sole survivor who jumped from a window after her daughter had been shot beside her. Perhaps he would say the Marguerite Rouffanche fired five bullets into her own back as she ran towards the presbytery garden?

In the same vein, he would refute the stories of the five men who

escaped from the executions in the Laudy barn and should claim that Dr. Jens Kruuse, a Dane who meticulously interviewed the survivors of the massacre in and around the village for his book *Madness at Oradour* had written one long falsehood.

If he goes to Oradour, Herr Landwehr will see that the ruins are of buildings gutted by fire and weathered by the passing of nearly 40 years. But even if one allows that there may have been munitions for the Resistance in one or two houses (which I don't) would that justify the murdering of 642 people?

I believe (as I say in my book) that the massacre was sparked off by the capture of Helmut Kampfe, the close friend of Dickmann (Diekmann?) who was responsible for the massacre. Dickmann was, I believe, told by someone—perhaps a French collaborator—that Kampfe was being held captive in Oradour and the massacre was his mad act of vengeance. There is no doubt that he was mentally unbalanced and, as Landwehr points out in his article, was accused by his CO of "sullying the Regimental name forever with his war crime." Small wonder that he is said to have subsequently committed suicide by going into battle without a helmet!

Philip Beck
Worcestershire, England

***

Dear Lewis: May 5, 1981

Your supplement to *The Journal of Historical Review* Volume 2 Number 2 was a pleasant surprise in contrast to your previous newsletter.

I am very glad to hear that the *Institute* finally seems to be making headway through the jungle of disinformation and persistent lies. Similar events are taking place in France and England, but to my knowledge the jungle is still almost impenetrable in this country.

The supporters of the holocaust myth are still misusing legal institutions to smother the historical truth. The sentences that are being passed all over the country are simply scandalous.

It is amusing to hear that a mass murderer like Begin has been cheeky enough to accuse Chancellor Helmut Schmidt in public of being an unconverted Nazi. He said Schmidt was "arrogant" and "greedy." And this was said about a representative of the Establishment in this country who has not only done his best to keep the holocaust myth alive, but who has been co-responsible for giving enormous sums away to Israel for "reparations." However, I feel it serves these Bonn puppets just right to be kicked in the pants like this by a man who continues to keep his hands open for more and more money.

May I remind you in this connection of the fact that our fellow-countrymen on the other side of the Iron Curtain have not yet paid a darned nickel to the Israelis for "reparation" and they are very unlikely to do so in the future.

The enclosed article was rounded up on my request by Fritz Berg of Fort Lee N.J. Although it was published as early as July, 1943, it certainly has not lost its historical or even actual value. Rudolf Hess has now turned 87 years of age, and on 10 May 1981 he "celebrated" his 40th anniversary of lonesome captivity.

What is most interesting about this article is the background of the Hess flight to Scotland on 10 May 1941.

If the writer of the story is right—and I have no doubt he is—then it becomes quite obvious why this personal messenger of Hitler's is very unlikely to be released before closing his eyes forever.

It would perhaps be worth while to look a little bit deeper into this matter, especially as mention was made in the article about further "secrets" that could not be revealed at the time.

It has now been revealed that the photostat copies of the files on the Hess flight are available in the National Archives in Washington. The British government has, however, ruled that these files continue to be kept under lock and key until 2017, i.e. not 30, as usual, but 60 years after the Nuremberg trials when this matter was dealt with.

I happened to be in British captivity myself in 1947, when the defendants in Nuremberg were given a chance to speak up for their own defense. I heard Hess speak on the radio and part of what he said is still very vivid in my mind. I remember the radio spokesman saying that, in all, Hess spoke as long as *twenty-one hours*! However, back in Germany later on and speaking to a great many people, nobody seems to remember having heard the same broadcast report in those days. All my countrymen can remember are fragments of sentences of that speech.

It is quite obvious therefore that this 21-hour defense speech is also being kept under lock and key until nobody of the present generation is alive anymore.

This shows how bad the conscience of a man like Churchill must have been. It also shows how desperately Hitler attempted to put an end to this "phoney war" of Churchill's.

Maybe the writer of the said article is still alive today and perhaps he is now ready to reveal the sources of his information. At any rate, I do feel that this article is worth while to be re-printed as a historical document by the IHR, what do you think about this idea?

I have learned of a man by the name of *Tyler Kent* who played a role as a go-between between Churchill and Roosevelt during the early years of the war. It is quite possible that he can also divulge a few more details about the Hess mission.

The short article enclosed herewith tells the story about one of the dirty tricks the war monger Churchill had up his sleeve: the use of poisonous gas on German cities on a large scale! 500,000 of these lethal bombs were already ordered by Churchill.

With very best wishes,

Hans v.d. Heide

***

Letters to the Editor
Daily Forty-Niner
California State University,
Long Beach, CA. 15 May 1981

I would like to respond to your 14 May 1981 article, "JDL Leader Assails Holocaust Denouncer."

Irv Rubin, the JDL's leader, can't understand why the University is "allowing this character (Professor Buchner) to teach at Cal State Long Beach."

One who recognizes the nature and purpose of such qualifications as Dr. Buchner has, as well as his proven ability to teach university level science courses, might respond in reference to Mr. Rubin himself by asking "why is the university allowing this character (Rubin) to *speak* at Cal State Long Beach"?

Are such freedoms of thought and speech retained only by those who do not hold such trained-for posts as Dr. Buchner?

If the University acknowledges Dr. Buchner's right to his personal views, who would twist this to presume rather arrogantly that the university is endorsing those views?

What business does Mr. Rubin have on campus anyway? Is he a teacher, a student? My tax dollars support that school on the basis that it trains students. What are Mr. Rubin's credentials?

Mr. Rubin says that the Institute for Historical Review is "dedicated to the physical extermination of the Jewish people." Rubin is a bald-faced liar and an extremely dangerous one at that. Or perhaps he has a will-to-believe such delusions of self-importance.

No amount of his really looking into what we are actually doing would affect his viewpoint one iota. He thrives on anti-Semitism. He eats it for breakfast. He tries with every ounce of his waking strength to produce it where it does not otherwise exist.

Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, Jewish author of *The Zionist Connection*, who has himself been attacked by the JDL writes; ". . . the JDL, despite an occasional rap on the knuckles, has been permitted to break the laws, shoot at the innocent, deface property, and attack with impunity."

And to justify this, Mr. Rubin and his ilk manufacture a "cause" to eradicate what they themselves are, in fact, creating.

Dr. Buchner, the IHR, and those who agree with our right to investigate, discover and disseminate are not the ones making the threats. It is Rubin who is making the threats.

He claims that the dissemination of our views is "like going into a theater and yelling, 'Fire.' " Now just who is yelling 'Fire'?

Mr. Rubin says we're all Nazis. That's an unfounded and pernicious smear, and again, Mr. Rubin is a liar.

When we say that millions of Jews were not killed or exterminated by the Nazis, our intent is not to lend any credibility to the Nazi regime. We publish our views because we find them to be true and we're in the business of righting the historical record. That's all.

Look at Mr. Rubin's police record if you will, and that of his associate Mordecai Levy. Listen to the antagonism and hatred in his voice and the voice of his "contingent." He is not mad because the Holocaust is being subjected to some sincere Revisionist inspection. He is simply mad.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Marcellus
Institute for Historical Review

Dear Sirs, 10 July 1981

As Chief of Security and Field Co-ordination for Displaced Persons, in West Germany, I interviewed many of all races, especially the Jews who came out of the Warsaw and Vienna Ghettos, and without exception, they all expressed a fear, if not a terror, of the "Jewish Committee" within the respective ghettos. There was no expression of fear of the German military or authorities outside the respective ghettos.

When I was more or less in charge of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I had as an advisor Ruther Eisler, who was going under the name of Ruth Fisher. She was head of the Communist party in Germany, and led the Communist members of the *Reichstag*. Prior to the *Reichstag* fire, she had defected to the Trotsky camp and was tried during the Stalin purge trials of 1936-38, and convicted *in absentia* of crimes against the state (treason) and was sentenced to be executed. The person assigned this murder was none other than her brother, Gerhardt Eisler, who was the top NKVD agent in the United States during and after the war (WWII), using the names of Hanbergers and Mr. Brown. As Brown he attended a meeting of the *Daily Worker*, and discharged Hathaway, the editor, for alcoholism. He replaced Hathaway with Budenz. The person attending that paper's board meeting, had never seen Brown before that day, and as far as I know never put two and two together. When Budenz eventually defected, he was in my custody (minimal) for several weeks, and he was able to identify Eisler as Brown.

Recently, the major news services carried a release stating that a German court had found the Communist charged with setting the *Reichstag* Fire, innocent. Whereupon, I contacted both services and gave my story. Both services refused to carry my release.

When I uncovered Ruth Fisher (Eisler), she became my unofficial advisor, and one day I asked her: "Who set the fire?" She turned on me, actually calling me stupid, etc., and then said in substance: "We planned the fire, executed its planning, it back-fired, and, as a result, Hitler was given good reason to eliminate the eighty-one Communists in the *Reichstag*, thereby gaining full control of that body, which in turn gave him the powers he needed to gain absolute control of Germany."

Cordially,

George McDavit
Phoenix, Arizona

***

Dear Sirs, 10 July 1981

As Chief of Security and Field Co-ordination for Displaced Persons, in West Germany, I interviewed many of all races, especially the Jews who came out of the Warsaw and Vienna Ghettos, and without exception, they all expressed a fear, if not a terror, of the "Jewish Committee" within the respective ghettos. There was no expression of fear of the German military or authorities outside the respective ghettos.

When I was more or less in charge of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I had as an advisor Ruther Eisler, who was going under the name of Ruth Fisher. She was head of the Communist party in Germany, and led the Communist members of the *Reichstag*. Prior to the *Reichstag* fire, she had defected to the Trotsky camp and was tried during the Stalin purge trials of 1936-38, and convicted *in absentia* of crimes against the state (treason) and was sentenced to be executed. The person assigned this murder was none other than her brother, Gerhardt Eisler, who was the top NKVD agent in the United States during and after the war (WWII), using the names of Hanbergers and Mr. Brown. As Brown he attended a meeting of the *Daily Worker*, and discharged Hathaway, the editor, for alcoholism. He replaced Hathaway with Budenz. The person attending that paper's board meeting, had never seen Brown before that day, and as far as I know never put two and two together. When Budenz eventually defected, he was in my custody (minimal) for several weeks, and he was able to identify Eisler as Brown.

Recently, the major news services carried a release stating that a German court had found the Communist charged with setting the *Reichstag* Fire, innocent. Whereupon, I contacted both services and gave my story. Both services refused to carry my release.

When I uncovered Ruth Fisher (Eisler), she became my unofficial advisor, and one day I asked her: "Who set the fire?" She turned on me, actually calling me stupid, etc., and then said in substance: "We planned the fire, executed its planning, it back-fired, and, as a result, Hitler was given good reason to eliminate the eighty-one Communists in the *Reichstag*, thereby gaining full control of that body, which in turn gave him the powers he needed to gain absolute control of Germany."

Cordially,

George McDavit
Phoenix, Arizona

***

it would be a difficult task. But it wasn't long before the 8th Corps, and particularly the 83rd Ohio Division under General Macon, realized they had "a nasty job ahead of them."

The Germans' main defense was concentrated in five strongpoints built by the Todt Organization: to the west of the city, the La Cite fort, a vast subterranean complex carved out of a peninsula between the Rance estauary and the Bay of Saint Servan; in the Bay of Saint Malo, two fortified islands, Cezembre and the Grand Bey; and to the east, the Montaigne Saint Joseph and the La Varde fort, natural geographical features fortified with concrete, which were the first stubborn pockets of resistance encountered by the U.S. forces coming from that direction.

The garrison commander, Colonel Andreas von Aulock, a European representative of General Motors before the war, directed operations from the underground complex. The two AA sites within the city were operated by the Luftwaffe. One, on the walls of the castle at the eastern end, was commanded by Lieutenant Franz Kuster, a pre-war lawyer who subsequently became a judge in West Germany, and the other, in a little public garden facing the sea, was run by an Austrian sergeant.

To this day, a proportion of the citizens of Saint Malo believe the Germans deliberately burnt the city as an act of spite when they realized they were defeated. But all the evidence is against this.

There were many eye-witnesses to the shower of incendiaries launched by the Americans from the east, south and west of the city and the remains of a large number of these missiles were subsequently found in the ruins and identified by experts. There was no evidence of any German incendiary device having been used. In any case, it would have been illogical for Von Aulock, who certainly wasn't a fanatic, to try to burn out the city when he knew the AA units were still there. Besides, he had on the whole been attentive to the safety of the people. He had urged them on several occasions to leave the city, warning them of the horror of street fighting such as he had witnessed at Stalingrad. But a large proportion had preferred to stay because they felt they would be safer in the vast deep cellars created by Saint Malo's famed corsairs for storing their booty, than in

the open country which might be transformed into a battlefield. They also feared that their houses might be looted of their valuables if left empty. Von Aulock decreed that any of his men caught looting would be shot, as would any NCO or officer who neglected his duty in this respect. Looting did take place, but the culprits were mainly civilians.

The Germans did, however, cause considerable damage in other respects. On 6 August, a minesweeper in the harbor shelled the cathedral spire which fell, causing extensive damage to the fabric. The excuse was that the spire was being used as an observation post by "terrorists." Von Aulock was furious and told Commander Breithaup of the 12th minesweeper flotilla that the act "hardly covered the German navy with glory."

The harbor installations, including the massive lock-gates, were blown up by the Germans on 7 August, and a number of vessels were scuttled there, thus ensuring that the port could not be used by the Allies.

Another German act was the rounding up of all the men between 16 and 60 in the city for internment at the Fort National, an historic fort on an islet near the castle, only accessible at low tide. This was Von Aulock's revenge for a skirmish which took place in the city on the night of 5-6 August. He was told that "terrorists" had fired on Germans. The French said it was a fight between German soldiers and mutinous sailors; there had been a marked slackening of discipline in the navy.

Unfortunately the fort was in the line of fire between the Americans coming from the east and the fortified island known as Le Grand Bey and inevitably a shell eventually fell in the midst of the several hundred hostages killing or mortally wounding 18.

The old city itself suffered from the exchange of fire between the Americans and the big guns in the underground fort. Many buildings were hit by shells as well as bombs dropped by aircraft.

However, if the damage had been restricted to shells and bombs, most of the city would have been spared. It was the concentrated attack with incendiary mortar shells which destroyed most buildings.

The Americans' belief in the presence of a large number of Germans within the city was fortified by two incidents. On 10 August, two jeeps carrying four Americans and five Frenchmen tried to enter the city by the main gate. The party was under the mistaken impression that it had been liberated. They came under a hail of machinegun fire. An American officer and two of the French were killed and the others taken prisoner.

The following day a truck carrying clothing and ammunition for the Resistance also tried to get in. The two occupants were captured and the vehicle was burnt.

These attacks were the work of the Luftwaffe men on the AA sites but the Americans watching about 500 yards away could well have thought in the confusion of the incidents that the defenders were a much larger force.

However, it is hard to understand why they were scornful of the news brought by the two French emissaries from the city. Yves Burgot and Jean Vergniaud were sent from the castle where they had been sheltering to ask for morphia for the wounded Americans and Germans. They were received coolly by an officer who asked how many Germans remained in the city. They told him there were less than a hundred but he would not accept this and the shelling and burning continued.

A truce was arranged on 13 August to allow the people to get out of the city. By this time a large part of it was either in flames or had been destroyed. The firemen could do little to prevent the spread of the fires as the Americans had severed the water main.

The Americans attacked with tanks on 14 August and, to their undoubted surprise, found the burning city almost empty.

The underground fortress continued to fight until 17 August when Von Aulock surrendered. He was subsequently accused of "the barbaric act of burning the corsairs' city," but after an examination of the ruins including the remains of incendiary shells and the questioning of witnesses, he was vindicated.

Rassinier to 'The Nation' *

PAUL RASSINIER

Dear Editor: 1 October 1962

I would like to make a few comments about the book review by Ernest Zaugg (*The Nation*, 14 July 1962) dealing with my three books about the German concentration camps, the responsibility for World War II and the Eichmann trial (*The Lie of Ulysses*, *Ulysses Betrayed by his Fellows*, and *The Real Eichmann Trial*). **

Genocide

Until Eichmann's arrest it was a sacred dogma of journalists to believe there were orders to exterminate the Jews issued by the top Nazis of the Third Reich. Nobody has ever produced such an order, but this has not prevented the theory that such orders were given from being stubbornly maintained. Then came the Eichmann trial. It was deemed necessary to prove that he was responsible for the exterminatons and had acted without orders. Hence, finally, the lack of evidence of such orders from the top Nazis was admitted. Dr. Kubovy, Directer of the Tel Aviv Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation, wrote (*La Terre Retrouvee*, 15 December 1960):

> No document signed by Hitler, Himmler or Heydrich exists which speaks of the extermination of the Jews. The word "Extermination" does not appear in Goering's letter to Heydrich about the final solution of the Jewish problem.

This is what I have been saying since 1948. It disposes of the theory of "deliberate genocide" in which Mr. Zaugg seems to believe.

Methods of Genocide

The official thesis is that 6 million Jews were exterminated, without orders naturally, as is now admitted. To exterminate such a number an extraordinary method was needed—to wit, gas chambers.

In this matter European public opinion has changed greatly since the first Nürnberg trials (1945-6). After a lecture tour I made in Germany covering a dozen cities, the Institute for Contemporary History (Institut fuer Zeitgeschichte) of Muenchen, a democratic institute, of course, was obliged on 19 August 1962 to state officially that "there were no gas chambers in any of the concentration camps in the territory called by the Nazis 'Greater Germany,' "—none in Dachau, none in Bergen Belsen, Mauthausen, Ravensbruch, etc. One concludes that the witnesses in the 13 Nürnberg trials and in the Eichmann trial who stated under oath that there were gas chambers in these camps were no more than vulgar false witnesses.

Mr. Zaugg accuses me of whitewashing the Nazis and giving aid and comfort to the neo-Nazis. My answer to this charge is that the best way to give aid and comfort to the neo-Nazis, if such there be, is to accuse the Germans of crimes which were never committed. It is astonishing that after 17 years of false accusations more damage has not been done in this respect.

Auschwitz

The question of the Auschwitz gas chambers has not been fully cleared up. They are the only ones which are still a problem. Thanks, in part, to my research we know the following:

a) On 8 April 1942 the economic section of the RSHA (Reichssicherheitshauptamt) ordered from Topf and Sons, Erfurt, crematoriums (not gas chambers) equipped with showers (Badeanstalten) and morgues (Leichenkeller). These showerbaths and morgues have been presented to the world as gas chambers. The official version is that these gas chambers were destroyed by the Germans on 17 October 1944 and rebuilt by the Russians after the war—just

as the "gas chambers" of Dachau were built after the war by the Americans. Now scholars are wondering whether the Russian-built gas chambers of Auschwitz are not perhaps "Potemkin villages," as are those built by the Americans in Dachau.

b) All witnesses at Nürnberg were agreed that these installations at Auschwitz which became "gas chambers" were constructed "in the heart of winter 1942-3," which means at the earliest the end of January or the beginning of February.

c) If these installations were gas chambers, they were at least not used as such "from autumn 1943 to May 1944" (Kastner Report, which, when printed by Kindler in Germany, was edited to suppress this passage). The only question that now remains is whether they were used as gas chambers from February until autumn, 1943, and after May, 1944.

We hope this will be cleared up in the trial of Richard Baer, camp commander at Auschwitz from 10 November 1943 to 25 January 1944. It is very doubtful that the gas chambers were used in the Baer period, which is perhaps the reason that since his arrest in October, 1960, his trial has been postponed five times. He was to be tried last November, but now the trial has again been postponed until spring! When and if this trial takes place the matter of the Auschwitz "gas chambers" will, we hope, be definitely cleared up.

There are only eleven doubtful months in which perhaps people were gassed in Auschwitz. How many people could have been gassed in these eleven months, if any were gassed?

The Six Million

It has been accepted as gospel truth that the Nazis murdered six million Jews. First question: where did they find these six million Jews, since the prewar Jewish statistics (Arthur Ruppin) prove without doubt that in the territories occupied by Hitler there never were six million Jews.

Furthermore, a booklet published July, 1961, by the Institute for Jewish Affairs of the World Jewish Congress, page 18, states that 900,000 of the six million "perished" in Auschwitz. Second question: where did the other 5.1 million

"perish"? Not in the gas chambers of "Greater Germany," since the official Institute for Contemporary History of Muenchen has stated that they never existed.

Perhaps at Chelmno, Belzec, Maidanek, Sobibor or Treblinka, all situated in Poland? The only document which speaks of gas chambers in these camps is the Gerstein document. It states there were "gas chambers of 25 square meters in which 750 to 800 persons were exterminated at one time." Gerstein, however, according to the official version, hanged himself in his prison in Paris on 4 July 1945. The document he allegedly wrote was so obviously phony that it was rejected as evidence at Nürnberg on 30 January 1946, and not permitted to be read before the court.

Jewish statistics of the prewar period, compared with those of after the war, show that the number of Jews who died during the war in the camps or elsewhere was about 1 million, a large enough figure. To explain it, it is not necessary to resort either to "deliberate genocide" or to "gas chambers," since anyone who has experienced the concentration camps knows that conditions there were bad enough to account for a large number of deaths. Many were killed in the guerrilla warfare on the Eastern front and in the saturation bombings.

Everything else which Mr. Zaugg says against my books shows that his imagination is without limits and that he has great talents, not for historical investigations, but for "Wild West" tales. This is a general weakness of American journalists. They do not realize that public opinion in Europe has evolved since 1945 as more and more light has been cast on wartime events. Most of the exaggerations about the concentration camps, the neo-Nazis and the revival of German militarism are fabrications invented by the manipulators of Bolshevism to isolate Germany from its neighbors and prevent the birth of the great nation, Europe.

By believing these legends the American press played the game of the Reds and helped lead the Slavs to the gates of Hamburg—the Slavs whom Charlemagne threw back to the banks of the Vistula 1,100 years ago. Do these irresponsible publicists want the Cossack horses drinking from the Rhine and the Russian tanks parading in the Sahara? If so, they

have but to continue to support the "historical verities" of the Communists.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Paul Rassinier
Professor Emeritus

* This letter was never published by *The Nation*.

** The bulk of the two former works is contained in the author's *Debunking the Genocide Myth*, IHR, 1979, 441pp, pb. $8.00 / hc. $15.50. *The Real Eichmann Trial* is also an IHR publication of 1979, 170pp, $4.00.

The Gas Chambers of Auschwitz Appear to be Physically Inconceivable

Dr. ROBERT FAURISSON

Zyklon B is a hydrocyanic acid that is given off by evaporation.

It is used for the disinfection of ships, silos and dwellings as well as for the destruction of pests.

It is still manufactured today in Frankfurt-on-Main. It is sold in Western Europe, in Eastern Europe, in the United States and nearly everwhere in the world.

Hydrocyanic gas is highly poisonous and very dangerous. One miligram per kilogram of body weight is sufficient to kill a man. In a closed place it will poison a man in several seconds and will kill him in several minutes. A man can lose consciousness and die by absorbing the gas through the skin.

This gas sticks to surfaces. It sticks not only to the skin and to the mucous membranes to the point of penetrating them, but it also sticks to wood, to plaster, to paint, and to cement, and it penetrates them. In an ordinary place where these materials are encountered, the gas cannot be ventilated after use; it is necessary to be contented with a natural airing-out process, which lasts nearly 24 hours.

Only specialized personnel, having gone through a period of instruction and having been awarded a diploma, can use this product or gas. They must wear gas masks with special filtering cartridges for hydrocyanic acid.

The preparations necessary for the gassing of a place, for example a dwelling place, are long and meticulous, especially in order to obtain a good air-tightness.

The granules of *Zyklon* from which the hydrocyanic gas is

released are not thrown at random, are not scattered by chance. This would be too dangerous later on. It is necessary to assure a calculated distribution. The granules are set down on display napkins.

When the gas is thought to have ended its destructive work, it is necessary that specialized personnel enter the place in order to open everything that would permit a natural airing-out. This is the most critical moment. The airing-out presents the greatest danger for participants as well as for non-participants. It is therefore necessary to proceed with it with special prudence and always while wearing gas masks. As a rule it is necessary to air out the place in such a way as to be able to reach the open air as soon as possible and in such a way that the gas will be evacuated from a side where every risk for non-participants is excluded.

The airing-out lasts at least twenty hours.

At the end of twenty hours, the specialized personnel come back into the place, while still wearing their masks. If it is possible, they raise the temperature of the place to 15 degrees centigrade. They leave, returning at the end of an hour, still with their masks, in order to go on to a test for the disappearance of the gas. If the test is favorable, the place is declared to be accessible without wearing a gas mask. But, if it is a question of a dwelling place, people will not be able to sleep in the place for the first night and the windows ought still to remain open during that first night. Mattresses, bed rolls and cushions must be beaten or shaken for at least an hour because they are impregnated with gas.

This gas is inflammable and explosive; there must not be any naked flame in the vicinity and, most definitely, it is necessary not to smoke.

In a more general way, in order to enter a place where there is some hydrocyanic gas, it is necessary always to wear a gas mask with a particularly strong filter cartridge; two cases then present themselves:—either the masked man will be exposed to concentrations lower than 1 percent in volume of hydrocyanic gas;—or he will be exposed to concentrations equal to or higher that 1 percent.

In the first case, he will be able to devote himself to some

light work; for example, he will be able to open windows that are easy to open, but on condition that after each step he goes outside in order to remove his mask there and to breathe the open air for at least ten minutes. In the second case, the exposure of the man to those concentrations must be tolerated only in case of necessity and for a period of time not to exceed one minute.

This gas can be used in pressurized fumigation chambers. It is used in the United States for the execution of a person condemned to death in the gas chamber. One must see one of these chambers and be acquainted with the process of their use in order to realize the extent to which it is difficult and dangerous to use hydrocyanic gas in order to kill a single man.

During the First World War, combat gasses had been used, but with very many disappointments and with nearly as much danger for one's own troops as for the enemy, so true is it that gas is the least controllable of all weapons. Many suicidal or accidental poisonings are there to prove it. But since the end of the war some Americans who wished for a more humane method of putting condemned prisoners to death, believed that nothing would be at the same time more humane and easier than to use a powerful gas to put the man to sleep until death would result. It was when they wanted to put their idea into practice that they realized the difficulties. The first execution of a condemned man by hydrocyanic gas took place in the penitentiary at Carson City in 1924; it narrowly missed turning into a catastrophe for the entourage. It was necessary to wait until 1936/1938 in order to obtain more reliable gas chambers. But even today, this method of execution remains critical for the executioners and for the entourage.

The small cockpit called a gas chamber is made entirely of glass and steel in order to avoid having the gas stick too much to the surfaces or penetrate them. The glass and steel are very thick for various technical reasons and especially in order that a vacuum can be created in the cockpit with a view to assuring it a good air-tightness; but a vacuum thus created brings some risks of implosion. The construction is

thus very strong.

Once the condemned person is killed by the emission of the gas the real difficulties begin. It is in effect necessary to enter into a place which, for the moment, is full of deadly gas and it is necessary there to handle a corpse impregnated with that gas.

The gas is not evacuated toward a chimney in the direction of the air outside; this would be too dangerous. In fact, it is driven back in the direction of a mixer where it is neutralized by a chemical base (ammonia). The acid thus gives way to a salt which will be washed away with a great deal of water. Nevertheless, the place still remains dangerous for a long time, as does the corpse. For the doctor and his aides who will have to enter the place and drag out the body, some precautions remain necessary. They will wait until a warning product (phenolphthaline) signals them that the deadly gas has been neutralized, at least for the most part. They will wear masks with special filtering cartridges. They will be wearing gloves and rubber aprons. They will wash the corpse very carefully with a jet, particularly in the mouth and in all of the folds of the body.

Beforehand, the simple preparation of the gas chamber for an execution will have required two days of work for two specialized men. The machinery is relatively important.

To use hydrocyanic gas to kill only one man is thus much more complicated and dangerous than one would generally imagine.

One must not confuse the complicated gas chambers which the use of this dangerous gas demands, with the rudimentary buildings that all the armies in the world use to train recruits in the wearing of gas masks with ordinary filter cartridges. These places are also called gas chambers. The gas used is relatively not very poisonous and is ventilated easily; the air-tightness of such buildings is quite relative.

When one knows all this, one is quite surprised at reading the testimonies or confessions about the use that the Germans are supposed to have made of *Zyklon B* to execute not one man at a time but hundreds or thousands of human beings at a time. The most complete of those testimo-

nies or confessions is that of the first of three successive commandants of Auschwitz: Rudolf Höss (whose name must not be confused with that of Rudolf Hess, the prisoner of Spandau). Rudolf Höss is *supposed* to have drawn up for his jailers and for his communist judges a confession whose text is *supposed* to have been reproduced in 1958, or eleven years later, in its original language by Dr. Martin Broszat, a member of the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich. That confession is known to the general public under the title *Commandant of Auschwitz*. First on page 166, then on page 126 of the German edition of the book one learns this:

> . . .A half hour after having released the gas (i.e. *Zyklon B*), they would open the door (of the gas chamber where there are several thousands of victims) and would start the apparatus for airing it out. They would begin immediately to take out the bodies.

He goes on to say that this tremendous job of taking out thousands of bodies, from which they removed the gold teeth or cut the hair, was carried out by resigned and indifferent people who during all that time did not cease to smoke and to eat.

That description is surprising. If those people smoked and ate, they were not even wearing gas masks. How could they smoke in a place with vapors from an inflammable and explosive gas? How could all of that be done near the doors of the crematory ovens in which they were burning thousands of bodies? How could they enter into a gas chamber still full of gas to handle those bodies that were full of gas, and that *immediately* after the opening of the door? How could they devote themselves to such a gigantic job for some hours when specialists, equipped with masks, can only remain in such an atmosphere for several minutes and on condition that they only devote themselves to efforts that do not go beyond the effort required to open windows that are easy to open? How could they, with bare hands, extract teeth and cut hair when one knows that, in an American gas chamber, the first concern of the doctor who enters into the cockpit with mask involves tousling the hair of the corpse with his rubber-gloved hands in order to expel from it the mole-

cules of hydrocyanic gas which have remained in the hair of that corpse in spite of all of the precautions taken? Who are these beings endowed with supernatural powers? From what world do these tremendous creatures come? Do they belong to our world which is ruled by inflexible, known laws of the physicist, the doctor, the chemist, the toxicologist? Or do they indeed belong to the world of the imagination where all those laws, even the law of gravity, are overcome by magic or disappear by enchantment?

If Rudolf Höss still lived, we would be able to pose these questions to him. Unfortunately, after his confession to the communists he was hanged. It remains for us therefore to pose these questions to other persons who have born witness before the courts and who say they have seen these "gas chambers" functioning. No court has yet posed questions of this type, for example, to a Dov Paisikovic or to a Filip Müller. Fortunately, what the judges have not done, an American historical institute did on 3 September 1979 at Los Angeles. The Institute for Historical Review (PO Box 1306, Torrance, California, 90505) has even promised a reward of $50,000.00. But, for nearly a year, no candidate has made himself known, not even Filip Müller, who lives in West Germany (68 Mannheim, Hochufenstrasse 31). His book, recently published in German, in English and in American and in French does not bring any element of an answer to the questions posed. In truth, furthermore, it accumlates still more mysteries and the affair becomes inextricable.

Sources

On *Zyklon*, see the Nürnberg documents NI-9098 and, especially, NI-9912.

On the necessary gas mask, see a work of the French Army, translated from an American Army manual: *The Gas Mask*, Technical Manual No. 3-205, translated from the American, TM 3-205 (1-2), War Department, Washington, 22 September 1943, a manual drawn up under the direction of the Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943, 154pp. See, in particular, p55.

On the testimony attributed to Rudolf Höss, see: *Kommandant in*

Auschwitz, Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen, eingeleitet und kommentiert von Martin Broszat, 1958, Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt.

On Filip Müller, see: *Sonderbehandlung, Drei Jahre in den Krematorien und Gaskammern von Auschwitz*, Deutsche Bearbeitung von Helmut Freitag, München, Verlag Steinhausen, 1979, 287pp. Translated into American: *Eyewitness Auschwitz, Three Years in the Gas Chambers*, Literary Collaboration of Helmut Freitag, foreword by Yehuda Bauer Stein and Day, 1979, 180pp. Translated into the French: *Trois ans dans une chambre à gaz d' Auschwitz*: Le Témoignage de l'un des seuls rescapés des commandos spéciaux, Pygmalion/Gérard Watelet, 1980, 252pp, with a preface by Claude Lanzman.

Additional

I keep at the disposal of every witness or of every court a study which ends with the following question: "What proof is there demonstrating the existence of 'gassing' at Auschwitz which did not already demonstrate the existence of 'gassing' at Dachau?"

We know today that there was never any "gassing" at Dachau, but for many years they presented a host of proofs and testimonies thanks to which they claimed to demonstrate the reality of those "gassings." It seemed to me to be a good idea to refer back to the proofs and testimonies proving that there had been some "gassings" at Ravensbrück where we likewise know that there were none. My conclusion is the following: between on the one hand the documents about Dachau (or about Ravensbrück) and, on the other hand, the documents about Auschwitz, there is no difference in quality, but only in quantity. On those first "gas chambers" or on the first "gassings," they have made up stories only during some 15 years, while on the others they have made up stories for 35 years. In one case as in the other we are not lacking either official documents or details to the nearest centimeter.

The Gas Chambers: Truth or Lie?

Questions by Antonio Pitamitz
To Robert Faurisson
(*Storia Illustrata*, August 1979)
Translated by Vivian Bird
Expanded, Reviewed, Corrected
by Dr. Robert Faurisson

QUESTION 1: Monsieur Faurisson, for some time now in France —and not only in France—you have found yourself at the center of a bitter controversy resulting from certain things which you have asserted on the subject of what is still one of the most somber pages in the history of the Second World War. We refer to the extermination of the Jews on the part of the Nazis. In particular, one of your assertions appears as dogmatic as it is incredible. Is it true that you deny that the gas chambers ever existed?

ANSWER 1:

I assert, in fact, that these famous alleged homicidal "gas chambers" are nothing but a tall story of wartime. This invention of wartime propaganda is comparable to the widespread legends of the First World War about "Teutonic barbarism." The Germans were then already accused (in the First World War) of completely imaginary crimes; of Belgian children with hands cut off; crucified Canadians; corpses turned into soap. [1] The Germans, I suppose, said similar things about the French.

German concentration camps did really exist but the whole world knows that they were not original or unique to the Germans. Crematorium ovens have also existed in certain

of these camps, but incineration is no more offensive or criminal than burial. The crematorium ovens even constitute progress from the sanitary point of view where there was a risk of epidemics. Typhus ravaged the whole of wartime Europe. The majority of corpses which are shown to us in photos are clearly the corpses of typhus victims. These photos illustrate the fact that the internees—and sometimes the guards—died of typhus. They prove nothing other than this. To exploit the fact that the Germans at times used crematorium ovens is not very honest. In asserting this one counts on the repulsion or feeling of unease and disquiet felt by people accustomed to burial and not to incineration. Imagine an oceanic population accustomed to burning its dead. Tell such a people that you bury your own and you will appear a kind of savage. Perhaps they would even suspect that in Europe persons "more or less alive" are placed in the earth! One displays one's complete dishonesty when in the same way, one presents as homicidal "gas chambers" the fumigation chambers (autoclaves) which were in reality used for the disinfecting of garments by gas. This never clearly formulated accusation has now been almost totally abandoned, but in certain museums or in certain books we are still confronted with a photo of one of these autoclaves, sited at Dachau, with an American soldier in front, about to decipher the time-table for gassings. [2]

Another form of gassing really existed in the German camps: this is the fumigation of buildings by gas to exterminate vermin. For this purpose the renowned Zyklon B was used, around which a fantastic legend has been built up. Zyklon B, whose license goes back to 1922, [3] is still used today, notably for the disinfecting of furniture, of barracks, of silos, of ships, but also for the destruction of fox burrows or of pests of all kinds. [4] It is very dangerous to handle for, as the letter "B" indicates, it is "Blausaure" ("blue" acid or prussic acid or hydrocyanic acid). In passing, it is worth noting that the Soviets, misunderstanding the significance of this letter, accused the Germans of having killed deportees with Zyklon A and with Zyklon B! [5]

But let us turn to the alleged homicidal "gas chambers." Until the year 1960 I still believed in the reality of these human *abattoirs* where, using industrial methods, the Germans would have killed internees in industrial quantities.

Then I learned that certain authors regarded the reality of these "gas chambers" as contestable; among them Paul Rassinier, who had been deported to Buchenwald and then to Dora. These authors ended up by forming a group of historians describing themselves as Revisionists. I studied their arguments. Of course, I also studied the arguments of the official historians. The latter believed in the reality of extermination in the "gas chambers." They are, if one wishes to so describe them, the "Exterminationists." [6] For many years I minutely examined the arguments of one and another. I went to Auschwitz, to Majdanek, and to Struthof. I have searched, in vain, for a single person capable of telling me: "I have been interned in such a camp and I have seen there, with my own eyes, a building which was undoubtedly a gas chamber." I have read many books and documents. For many years, I have studied the archives of the Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine (CDJC) at Paris. Obviously, I took a special interest in the so-called "war crimes" cases.

I have devoted very special attention to what has been presented to me as being "admissions" on the part of the SS or of Germans generally. I am not going to enumerate for you here the names of all the specialists whom I have consulted. Strangely enough, it only took a few minutes of conversation before these "specialists" in question would declare to me: "Now, you must know, I am not a specialist on gas chambers." And an even more curious thing: there does not exist to this day any book, nor even any article from the Exterminationist school on the subject of the "gas chambers." I know that perhaps certain titles can be quoted to me, but these titles are deceptive.[7] In reality, in the formidable mountain of writings devoted to the German camps, there exists nothing which concerns their *sine qua non:* the "gas chambers!" No Exterminationist has written on the "gas chambers." The most one can say is that Georges Wellers, of the CDJC, attempted to address this subject in an attempt to plead for partial acceptance of the veracity of the Gerstein document, about the Belzec [8] "gas chambers."

On the other hand, the Revisionists have written quite a lot about the "gas chambers" to say that their existence was dubious, or to affirm frankly that their existence was impossible. My personal opinion is joined to the latter. The existence of the "gas chambers" is *completely* impossible. My

reasons are primarily those which the Revisionists have accumulated in their publications. Next, there are those proofs which I have discovered myself.

I have thought it necessary to start at the beginning. You know that in general it takes a long time to perceive that one actually ought to have begun at the beginning. I realized that all of us would talk of the "gas chambers" as if we knew the sense of these words.

Among all those who make statements, speeches or use sentences in which the expression "gas chamber" appears, how many of those people actually know what they are talking about? It has not taken me very long to realize that many people commit one of the most glaring errors. These people imagine a "gas chamber" as being similar to a mere bedroom under the door of which a household gas is released. These people forget that an execution by gas is by definition profoundly different from a simple suicidal or accidental asphyxiation. In the case of an execution, one must carefully avoid all risk of illness, poisoning or death for the executioner and his crew. Such a risk is to be avoided before, during and after the execution. The technical difficulties implied herein are considerable. I was most anxious to know how domestic minks were gassed, how foxes were gassed in foxholes, and how in the U.S. a person who was sentenced to death was executed by gassing. I have found that, in the vast majority of cases, hydrocyanic acid was used for such purposes. This was precisely the same gas which the Germans used to fumigate their barracks. It was also with this gas that they allegedly killed groups of individuals as well as great masses of people. I have therefore studied this gas. I wanted to know its use in Germany and in France. I have reviewed ministerial documents governing the use of this highly toxic product. I had the good fortune of discovering some documents on Zyklon B and hydrocyanic acid which had been gathered by the Allies in the German industrial archives at Nürnberg.

Then, with greater scrutiny I re-examined certain statements and confessions which had been made in German and Allied courts concerning the use of Zyklon B for putting prisoners to death, and I was shocked. And now, you in turn will also be shocked. I will first read to you the statement or confession of Rudolf Höss. Then, I will tell you the results of

my research, purely physical, on hydrocyanic acid and Zyklon B. (Please bear in mind R. Höss was one of the three successive commanding officers at Auschwitz; all three of whom were detained and interrogated by the Allies. Only Höss left a confession, for which we are indebted to his Polish jailers.)

In this confession, the description of the actual gassing is remarkably short and vague. However, it is essential to realize that all those others who claim to have been present at this sort of an operation are also vague and brief and that their statements are full of contradictions on certain points. Rudolf Höss writes, "Half an hour after having released the gas, the door would be opened and the fan turned on. The bodies immediately began to be removed." [10] I call your attention to the word "immediately"; in German the word is *sofort*. Hoss then adds that the crew in charge of handling and removing 2,000 bodies from the "gas chamber" and transporting them to the crematory ovens did so while "eating or smoking"; therefore, if I understand correctly, these duties were all performed without gas masks. Such a description runs counter to all common sense. It implies that it is possible to enter an area saturated with hydrocyanic acid without taking any precautionary measures in the barehanded handling of 2,000 cyanided cadavers which were probably still contaminated with the fatal gas. The hair (which was supposedly clipped after the operation) was undoubtedly impregnated with the gas. The mucous membranes would have been impregnated also. Air pockets between the bodies which were supposedly heaped one on top of the other would have been filled with the gas. What kind of superpowerful fan is able to instantly disperse so much gas drifting through the air and hidden in air pockets? Even if such a fan had existed, it would have been necessary to perform a test for the detection of any remaining hydrocyanic acid and to develop a procedure for informing the crew that the fan had actually fulfilled its function and that the room was safe. Now, it is abundantly clear from Höss' description that the fan in question must have been endowed with magical powers in order to be able to disperse all of the gas with such flawless performance so that there was no cause for concern or need for verification of the absence of the gas!

What mere common sense suggested is now confirmed by the technical documents concerning Zyklon B and its usage.[11] In order to fumigate a barrack, the Germans were constrained by numerous precautionary measures: specially trained teams which were licensed only after an internship at a Zyklon B manufacturing plant; special materials including especially the "J" filters which when used in gas masks were capable of protecting an individual under the most rigorous toxic conditions; evacuations of all surrounding barracks; warnings posted in several languages and bearing a skull and cross-bones; a meticulous examination of the site to be fumigated in order to locate and seal any fissures or openings; the sealing of any chimneys or airshafts and the removal of keys from doors. The cans of Zyklon B were opened at the site itself. After the gas had apparently killed all the vermin, the most critical operation would begin: this was the ventilation of the site. Sentries were to be stationed at a certain distance from all doors and windows, their backs to the wind, in order to prevent the approach of all persons. The specially trained crew equipped with gas masks would then enter the building and unclog the chimneys and cracks, and open the windows. This operation completed, they had to go outside again, remove their masks and breathe freely for ten minutes. They had to put their masks on again to re-enter the building and perform the next step. Once all of this work was completed, it was still necessary to wait TWENTY hours. Actually, because Zyklon B was "difficult to ventilate, since it adheres strongly to surfaces," the dispersion of the gas required a long natural ventilation. This was especially important when great volumes of the gas were employed as in the case of a barrack containing more than one floor. (When Zyklon B was used in an autoclave with a total volume of only 10 cubic meters, ventilation (forced or artificially) was still necessary.) After twenty hours had elapsed, the crew would return with their masks on. They would then verify by means of a paper test (the paper would turn blue in the presence of hydrocyanic acid) as to whether or not the site was indeed again fit for human habitation. And so we see that a site which had been gassed was not safely accessible until a minimum of 21 hours had elapsed. As far as French legislation is concerned, the minimum is set at 24 hours.[12]

It becomes, therefore, apparent that in the absence of a

magical fan capable of instantly expelling a gas that is "difficult to ventilate, since it adheres strongly to surfaces," the "human slaughterhouse" called a "gas chamber" would have been inaccessible for nearly a full day. Its walls, floors, ceiling would have retained portions of a gas which was highly poisonous to man. And what about the bodies? These cadavers could have been nothing less than saturated with the gas, just as the cushions, mattresses and blankets discussed in the same technical document on the use of Zyklon B would have been saturated also. These mattresses, etc., had to be taken out of doors to be aired and beaten for an hour under dry atmospheric conditions and for two hours when the weather was humid. When this was accomplished, these items were then heaped together and beaten again if the paper test revealed any further presence of hydrocyanic acid.

Hydrocyanic acid is both inflammable and explosive. How could it then have been used in close proximity to the entrance of crematory ovens? How could one have entered the "gas chamber" while smoking?

I have not yet even touched upon the subject of the superabundance of technical and physical impossibilities which become apparent upon an actual examination of the site and the dimensions of the supposed "gas chambers" at Auschwitz and Auschwitz-Birkenau. Moreover, just as an inquisitive fact-finder of the Polish museum may discover, these chambers were in reality nothing more than "cold storage rooms" (mortuaries) and were typical of such rooms both in lay-out as well as size. The supposed "gas chamber" of Krema II at Birkenau, of which there remains only a ruin, was in fact a morgue, located below ground in order to protect it from heat and measuring 30 meters in length and 7 meters down the center to allow for the movement of wagons). The door, the passageways, the freight lift (which measured only 2.10 meters by 1.35 meters) which led to the crematory chamber were all of Lilliputian dimensions in comparison to the insinuations of Höss's account. [13] According to Höss, the gas chamber could easily accommodate 2,000 standing victims, but had a capacity of 3,000. Can you imagine that? Three thousand people crammed into a space of 210 square meters. In other words, to make a comparison, 286 people standing in a room measuring 5 meters by 4 meters! Do not be deceived into believing that before their

retreat the Germans blew up the "gas chambers" and crematory ovens to conceal any trace of their alleged crimes. If one wishes to obliterate all trace of an installation which would be intrinsically quite sophisticated, it must be scrupulously dismantled from top to bottom so that there remains not one shred of incriminating evidence. Destruction by means of demolition would have been ingenuous. If explosives had been employed, mere removal of the concrete blocks would still have left this or that telltale sign. As a matter of fact, Poles of the present day Auschwitz museum have reconstructed the remains of some "Kremas" (meaning, in reality, reconstructions of crematoria and supposed "gas chambers"). However, all of the artifacts shown to tourists attest to the existence of crematory ovens rather than to anything else.[14] If it was the Germans who dynamited those installations (as an army often does in retreat) it was precisely because those installations concealed nothing suspicious. In Majdanek, on the other hand, they left intact installations which were dubbed "gas chambers" after the war.

In the U.S.A. the first execution by gassing took place on 8 February 1924 in the prison of Carson City, Nevada. Two hours after the execution, poison traces were still to be found in the grounds of the prison. Mr. Dickerson, warden of the prison, declared that as far as the condemned man was concerned, the method of execution was certainly the most humane so far used. But he added that he would reject this method in the future because of the danger to the witnesses.[15] Recently, on 22 October 1979, Jesse Bishop was executed by gas at the same prison.

The real gas chambers, such as those created in 1924 and developed by the Americans around 1936-1938 offer some idea of the inherent complexity of such a method of execution. [16] The Americans, for one thing, only gas one prisoner at a time normally (some gas chambers exist, however, which are equipped with two seats for the execution of two brothers, for example). The prisoner is totally immobilized. He is poisoned by the hydrocyanic acid (actually by the dropping of sodium cyanide pellets into a container of sulfuric acid and distilled water which results in release of hydrocyanic acid gas). Within approximately 40 seconds, the prisoner dozes off, and in a few minutes he dies. Apparently, the gas causes no discomfort. As in the case of Zyklon

B, it is the dispersion of the gas which causes problems. Natural ventilation for 24 hours is not possible in this case. Obviously, the location of the site of execution precludes such ventilation without seriously endangering the guards as well as other prison inmates. What, then, is the best course of action with a gas which poses such difficult problems of ventilation? The solution is to transform the acidic vapors into a solid salt which can then be flushed out with water. For this purpose, ammonia vapors which are basic are used to react with the acid vapors to form the salt by chemical reaction. When the hydrocyanic acid has all but vanished, a warning signal would alert the attending physician and his aides who are located on the opposite side of a glass barrier. The warning signal is phenolphtalein. It is arranged in containers located at various places in the chamber and turns from pink to purple in the absence of hydrocyanic acid. Once the absence of the poison is indicated and once an arrangement of fans draws the ammonia fumes out through an exhaust vent, the physician and his assistants enter the chamber wearing gas masks. Rubber gloves are used to protect the hands. The doctor ruffles through the convict's hair so as to brush out any residual hydrocyanic acid. Only after a full hour has elapsed since the death, can the doctor and his assistants enter the chamber. The convict's body is washed very carefully and the room is hosed down. The ammonia gas has by this time been expelled via a high chimney stack above the prison. Because of the danger to guards who are normally stationed in the prison watch towers, in some prisons the guards are required to leave their post during such an execution. I will just mention the other requirements for a completely air-tight gas chamber such as the need for locks, "Herculite" glass barriers of considerable thickness (because of the risk of implosion since a vacuum has to be made) a vacuum system, mercury valves, etc.

A gassing is not an improvisation. If the Germans had decided to gas millions of people, a complete overhaul of some very formidable machinery would have been absolutely essential. A general order, instructions, studies, commands and plans would surely have been necessary also. Such items have never been found. Meetings of experts would have been necessary: of architects, chemists, doctors,

and experts in a wide range of technical fields. Disbursements and allocations of funds would have been necessary. Had this occurred in a state such as the Third Reich, a wealth of evidence would surely have survived. We know, for example, down to the pfennig the cost of the kennel at Auschwitz and of the bay trees which were ordered for the nurseries. Orders for projects would have been issued. Auschwitz and Birkenau would not have been camps where so much coming and going would have been allowed. In fact, it was because of all this to-ing and fro-ing, and in order to prevent any increase in escapes, that it was found necessary for registration numbers to be tattooed onto prisoners' arms.[17] Civilian workers and engineers would not have been permitted to mingle with the inmates. Passes would not have been granted to Germans in the camp, and their family members would not have had visiting rights. Above all, the prisoners who had served their sentences would not have been released and permitted to return to their respective countries: that well guarded secret among historians was revealed to us several years ago in an article by Louis De Jong, Director of the Institute of World War II History of Amsterdam.[18] Moreover, in the United States the recent publication of aerial photographs of Auschwitz deals a death blow to the extermination fable: even in the summer of 1944 at the height of the influx of Hungarian Jews, there is no indication of any human pyre or throng of prisoners near the crematorium (but an open gate and a landscaped area are clearly visible) and there is no suspicious smoke (although the smoke stacks of the crematoria reportedly spewed forth flames continuously that were visible from a distance of several kilometers both day and night).[19]

I will conclude with a comment on what I regard as the criterion of false evidence regarding the gas chambers. I have noticed that all of these statements, vague and inconsistent as they are, concur on at least one point: the crew responsible for removing the bodies from the "gas chambers" entered the site either "immediately" or a "few moments" after the deaths of the victims. I contend that this point alone constitutes the cornerstone of the false evidence, because this is a physical impossibility. If you encounter a person who believes in the existence of the "gas chambers," ask him how, in his opinion, the thousands of cadavers were removed to make room for the next batch.

QUESTION 2: How can you assert this, after all that has been said and written during the past 35 years? After all that the survivors of the camps have recounted? After the cases brought against war criminals? After Nürnberg? Upon what proofs and upon what documents do you base your assertions?

ANSWER 2:

Many historical errors have lasted more than 35 years. What certain "survivors" have recounted does indeed constitute evidence, but it is evidence among others. Testimony evidence alone is not proof. In particular, the "evidence" presented at the "war crimes" trials ought to be examined with special caution. Unless I am mistaken, not a sole witness in 35 years has ever been prosecuted for perjury; a fact which amounts to giving a watertight guarantee to everyone desirous of providing evidence of "war crimes." Furthermore, this also explains the fact that earlier tribunals have "established" the existence of "gas chambers" in parts of Germany where it has now been finally and firmly established that there were none (for example, throughout the entire territory of the Old Reich).

The judgements pronounced at Nürnberg have only a relative value. The vanquished were judged by their victors. There was not the least possibility of appeal. Articles 19 and 21 of the Statutes of this political tribunal cynically gave it the right of not having to have solid proof; they even validated hearsay evidence. [20] All the other trials for "war crimes" have, as a result, been inspired by the legislation at Nürnberg. The trials of witches and sorcerers through the centuries used to proceed in such a manner.

There have existed, at least at first glance, "proofs" and "witnesses" of gassing at Oranienburg, at Buchenwald, at Bergen-Belsen, at Dachau, at Ravensbruck, and at Mauthausen. Professors, priests, Catholics, Jews, Communists, have all attested to the existence of "gas chambers" in these camps, and of their use for killing internees. To take only one example: Mgr. Piguet, Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand, has written that Polish priests have passed through the "gas chambers" of Dachau. [21] But since 1960 it has been officially recognized that no one was ever gassed at Dachau. [22]

But even more outrageous: there have been many cases where those in charge in certain camps have confessed to the

existence and the functioning of homocidal "gas chambers" where it has since been revealed by investigation that none ever existed. As far as Ravensbruck is concerned, the commandant of the camp (Suhren), his deputy (Schwarzhuber), and the camp doctor (Dr. Treite), have all admitted to the existence of a "gas chamber" and have even described, in a vague fashion, its operation. [23] They were executed or they committed suicide.

The same scenario existed for the commandant Ziereis at Mauthausen who, in 1945, on his death bed, is reported to have also made such confessions. [24]

One should not immediately assume that the admissions of the Ravensbruck administrators were extorted from them by the Russians or by the Poles. It was actually the judicial apparatus of Britain and of France which obtained these confessions. An even more disturbing factor is that the "confessions" were extracted several years after the war's end. The necessary pressure continued to be applied to such unfortunates right up until as late as 1950, when a man like Schwarzhuber collaborated with his interrogators, or his judges, or his bench magistrates.

No serious historian pretends any longer that people were gassed in any camp anywhere in the Old Reich. Today, allegations are only made about certain camps situated in Poland. 19 August 1960 constituted an important date in the history of the myth of the "gas chambers." On this day, the newspaper *Die Zeit* published a letter which was entitled "No gassing at Dachau." [25] From the content of the letter, a better title would have been "No gassing anywhere in the Old Reich"; (Germany with its 1937 frontiers.) This letter emanated from Dr. Martin Broszat, director since 1972 of the Institute of Contemporary History at Munich. This Dr. Broszat is a convinced anti-Nazi. He belongs to the group of Exterminationist historians. He believes in the authenticity of the "confessions" of Rudolf Hoss, which he published in 1958 (but with serious cuts of the text in the passages where Hoss had exaggerated "a little too much"—probably obeying the suggestions of his Polish jailers. [26] In brief, Dr. Broszat admitted on 19 August 1960 that gassing had never existed in the whole of the Old Reich. He added, using a confused expression, that there had been gassing "above all"(?) at some chosen points in Poland, for instance Auschwitz. [27]

All the official historians, as far as I know, have concluded by agreeing with Dr. Broszat. I deplore the fact that Dr. Broszat has contented himself with only a letter. A scientific paper was necessary, and detailed explanations were indispensable. It was necessary to explain to us why the proof, the evidence, and the confessions—all of which were considered unimpeachable up to that point—had suddenly lost all of their value. We are still waiting for the explanations of Dr. Broszat after nearly 20 years. [28] They would be valuable to us in determining if the proof, the evidence, and the confessions which we possess on the gassings at Auschwitz or Treblinka [29] are more valuable than the proof, evidence, and confessions which we possess on the faked gassings of Buchenwald or of Ravensbruck. In the meantime, it is extremely curious that the evidence collected (mainly) by the French, British and American tribunals should suddenly lose all its value in this way, while the evidence collected by the Polish and Soviet tribunals should preserve its value on the same subject!

In 1968, it was the turn of the "gas chamber" at Mauthausen (in Austria) to be declared mythical by an Exterminationist historian: Olga Wormser-Migot, in her thesis on *The Nazi Concentration Camp System*, in particular the section titled "The problem of the gas chambers." [30] Let us retain this heading; for according to the admissions of the Exterminationist historians themselves, there does exist a "PROBLEM of the gas chambers!"

In regard to the false confessions, I one day asked the Exterminationist historian Joseph Billig (attached to the CDJC) how he could, for his part, explain them. Here is his reply: They were, so he said, "psychotic phenomena!" For my part, I have an explanation to offer about these alleged "psychotic phenomena" as well as about the "schizoid apathy" of Höss on the day of his depositions before the Nurnberg Tribunal. Hoss had been tortured by his British jailers. [31] He had been "interrogated with a riding whip and primed with alcohol." Likewise at the Dachau Trial, the Americans—as revealed in particular by the Van Roden Commission of inquiry—had abominably tortured other German accused. [32]

But torture more often than not is useless. The procedures of intimidation are numerous. The massive universal con-

demnation which was brought to bear on the accused Nazis still retains its potency today. When "Anathema resounds with a religious unanimity as dignified as in the great mediaeval communions" there is nothing one can do against it, especially if the lawyers come into play, and impress upon the defendants that concessions are necessary. I well remember my own hatred of the Germans during the war, and just after its end. It was an incandescent hatred which I believed was voluntary. But with the passing of time, I perceived that it was not in fact mine but had been breathed into me. My hatred stemmed from the British radio, from the propaganda of Hollywood, and from the Stalinist press. I myself would have been merciless toward any German who should have told me that he had been a guard at some camp, and that he had not seen any of the massacres which the entire world talked about. If I had been his judge, then I would have considered it my duty to force him to "confess."

For 35 years this scenario involving German defendants has been comparable to that against witches and sorcerers of the Middle Ages. Let us consider for a moment the incredible courage which would be needed for one of these accused witches to dare to say to her tribunal: "The best proof that I have not had dealings with the Devil is simply that the Devil does not exist." Most of the time, those so-called witches could not believe the *facts* they were blamed for, but they would go along with, or pretend to go along with, their accusing-judges' belief in the Devil. (Accusing-judges during the French Revolution were at one and the same time judge and prosecutor.) In the same way, Dr. Dürrfeld, who had been an engineer at Auschwitz, initially told his judges that he personally had never suspected the existence of "gas chambers" in the camp; then later, joining the fashionable belief, he declared to the tribunal his indignation at "this brand of infamy for the German people." [33]

The witch would use deceit with her judges, just as the Germans, even today during the "Majdanek" trial in Düsseldorf, deceive their judges too. For example, the witch might admit that the Devil had been there on such and such a day, but that he was at the top of a hill while she herself had remained at the foot of the hill. Likewise, a German defendant endeavors to demonstrate that he himself had nothing

to do with the "gas chambers." Sometimes, he even goes so far as to say that he assisted in pushing people into the "gas chamber" or even that he was ordered to pour a product through a trap in the ceiling under threat of execution if he disobeyed.[34] Thus, he often gives the impression of sidestepping the issue. His accusers think: "Here again is one who seeks to get out of his predicament. They are extraordinary, these Germans! They almost never saw or heard anything!" The truth, however, is that they neither saw nor knew anything concerning what it was wished they should say in the matter of gassing.[35] Any reproach should be directed at the accusers, not at the defendants who are caught up in the only defense strategy left open to them. The lawyers have a grave responsibility for the adoption of this strategy. I do not speak of those lawyers who, like nearly everyone, believe that the "gas chambers" existed. I speak of those who know or suspect that they are confronted with an enormous lie. They prefer not to raise this question, either in their own interests or in their clients' interests. Eichmann's lawyer did not believe in the existence of the "gas chambers" but that did not prevent him from deliberately avoiding opening this can of worms at the trial in Jerusalem.[36] One cannot reproach him for this. I understand that the statute of this tribunal allowed for the dismissal of the defense lawyer if he should present any argument which fitted the term "intolerable" or a term approximating this.

An old resort of lawyers, a resort necessitated on occasion by the needs of the defense, is to plead the *seeming truth* rather than the *actual truth*. The truth is sometimes too difficult to gain acceptance into the judges' minds. One has to be contented with pragmatism. An example admirably demonstrates this. It is recounted by Maître Albert Naud, the lawyer representing Lucien Léger, whom the entire French press regarded as the perpetrator of an abominable crime. Lucien Léger protested his innocence. He chose Maître Naud as his lawyer. The lawyer went to see him in prison. He said to him: "Léger, be serious! If you want me to be your lawyer, we are going to plead guilty." A bargain was struck. Léger saved his head. Some years later, Maître Naud became convinced that Léger was innocent. He developed an enormous

complex because he had forced Léger to plead guilty. He summoned all of his powers to obtain a retrial.[37] Too late. Naud died. And Léger, if he is innocent, will probably pay until the end of his days for the abominable attitude of the press and the blindness of his lawyer.

A tribunal has no capacity for determining historical truth. Even historians have very often the utmost trouble in distinguishing the factual truth on a point of history. The independence of the judges is necessarily very relative. Judges read newspapers just like everyone else. They keep informed, at least in part, through the radio or television. Reviews and books present to them, as to all of us, "documents" or "photographs" of Nazi atrocities. Unless they are especially skilled in the critical appraisal of this kind of document or photos, they tend to fall into the more blatant traps of the media-orchestrated propaganda. Simultaneously, the judges are concerned to bring about respect for public order, public morality, certain norms, usages and beliefs, even, of public life. All of this, without counting the anxiety of ever seeing their name villified in the press, can only be conducive to judgements in matters of "war crimes" which the historian himself is not obliged to accept as his own.

Justice has been itself judged. At no time during this kind of trial has justice considered asking for an expert's report about the weapon of the crime. When they are suspected of being instruments of a crime, items such as a knife, a rope, or a revolver, are all subject to expert forensic appraisal. Yet, those objects have nothing mysterious about them. But in the case of the "gas chambers" there has not been a *single* forensic appraisal in 35 years! There is certainly talk of an appraisal supposedly made by the Soviets, but in every case the text of it seems to have remained secret.

For one and a half years, at the Frankfurt trial of 1963-65, a German tribunal conducted the affair called "the Auschwitz guards trial," without ordering any expert forensic appraisal of the actual device used for the crime. The same happened at the Majdanek trial at Dusseldorf and, just after the war, for the Struthof trial in France. This absence of forensic expertise is even less excusable when one considers that not one judge, not one prosecutor, not one lawyer, possessed any experience on the nature and the functioning of these ex-

traordinary "human *abattoirs*." At Struthof and Majdanek these "chambers" are, however, still represented as being an original fixture: therefore it would suffice to examine the "instrument of the crime" on the spot.

At Auschwitz things are less clear. At the principal camp (Auschwitz I) tourists are led to believe that the "gas chamber" is authentic, but when the museum authorities are pressed with questions, they beat a retreat and talk of a "replica" (which is nothing other than downright deceit, easily proved as such from certain archive documents). At the Birkenau annex (Auschwitz II) one is only shown the ruins of the "gas chambers." But even there forensic examination is perfectly possible. To an archaeologist even a few meager indices sometimes suffice in order to reveal the nature and the purpose of an encampment inhabited for several centuries. To give you some idea of the complacent attitude taken by the lawyers at the trial in Frankfurt, even to the extent of agreeing with the accusations *in advance*(!), I would tell you that one of these lawyers even had his photograph taken by the press in the process of lifting a trapdoor (sic!) of the pretended "gas chamber" at the principal camp at Auschwitz.[38] Ten years after the trial I asked this lawyer what had caused him to consider the building in question a "gas chamber." His written reply was more than evasive. It resembled the reply which has been made to me by the authorities of the Dachau Museum. I asked the Dachau people in writing upon what documents did they base their confirmation that a certain piece of camp equipment was an unfinished "gas chamber." In effect, I was surprised to learn that it could be determined that an unfinished structure was destined to become, once completed, a thing which no one had ever seen in his life. One day I will publish my correspondence with these authorities as well as with the officials of the International Dachau Committee at Brussels.

You ask me upon what proofs and upon what documents I base my declaration that the "gas chambers" never existed. I believe that I have already largely replied to this question. I would add that a good part of these proofs and documents are those of the accusers.[39] It suffices to re-read through the texts of the prosecution in order to perceive that the accusation bordered on the opposite of the result which it wanted to

establish. The basic texts are the 42 volumes of the International Military Tribunal (IMT), the 15 volumes of the Nürnberg Military Tribunal (NMT), the 19 volumes published by the University of Amsterdam, the stenographic transcripts of the Eichmann trial, various verbal proceedings relating to interrogations, the works of Hilberg, of Reitlinger, of Adler, of Langbein, of Olga Wormser-Migot, the *Encyclopedia Judaica*, the *Memorial* by Klarsfeld (very interesting for the list of fake gassings), the publications of different institutes. I have, above all, worked a great deal at the CDJC of Paris. But I was hounded at the beginning of 1978, on the initiative, in particular, of Georges Wellers, because it was known at what conclusions I had already arrived in regard to the "gas chambers" and "genocide." The CDJC is a semi-public body. It receives public money. Nonetheless, it arrogates to itself the right to hound those who do not think as it requires. And it says so!

QUESTION 3: You have gone so far as to deny any deliberate intention on the part of Hitler to exterminate the Jews. And lastly, in the course of a debate on Swiss-Italian television, you have said: "Hitler never had a single person killed because they were Jewish." What exactly do you mean to say with this phrase?

ANSWER 3:

I say exactly this: "Hitler never ordered nor admitted that anyone should be killed on account of his race or his religion."

This phrase is perhaps shocking to certain people, but I truly believe it. Hitler was anti-Jewish and racist. His racism was, moreover, not opposed to fostering admiration for the Arabs and Hindus. He was hostile to colonialism. On 7 February 1945 he declared to his entourage: "The Whites have carried to these (colonial) people the worst that they could carry: the plagues of the world: materialism, fanaticism, alcoholism, and syphilis. Moreover, since what these people possessed on their own was superior to anything we could give them, they have remained themselves. . . . The sole result of the activity of the colonizers is: they have everywhere aroused hatred."[40]

Hitler became hostile to the Jews rather late. Before saying

and repeating that the Jews are "the grand masters of the lie,"[41] he had been rather favorable toward them. He writes in *Mein Kampf:* "They were persecuted (on account of their beliefs) as I believed, often making my dislike of unfavorable assertions about them almost reach the point of repugnance."

Personally, I know Hitler rather poorly, and he interests me no more than Napoleon Bonaparte. If he raved, then I do not see why we ourselves should rave about him. Let us make efforts to speak of Hitler with the same *sang-froid* with which one used to speak of Amenophis Akhenaton. Between Hitler and the Jews there was an inexpiable war. It is evident that each holds the other responsible for this conflict. In the person of Chaim Weizmann, president of the World Jewish Congress (and future president of the state of Israel), the international Jewish community declared war on Germany on 5 September 1939.[42] Hitherto, as early as 1934, the hostility of the international Jewish community had been manifested by the exigencies of the economic boycott against Nazi Germany.[43] Obviously it had been motivated by retaliation against the measures taken by Hitler against the German Jews. This deadly chain of events, on the part of both sides, was to lead to the world war. Hitler said: "The Jews and the Allies wish for our annihilation, but it is they who will be destroyed," while the Allies and the Jews said: "Hitler and the Nazis and their allies wish for our destruction, but it is they who will be destroyed." The two hostile camps during the whole course of the war thus intoxicated themselves in belligerent and fanatical proclamations. The enemy became a beast to be slaughtered. Think, in the same fashion, of the words of the Marseillaise: "Qu'un sang impur abreuve nos sillions!" ("Let our soil be drenched by their impure blood!")

Moreover, the Allies waged a pitiless war against the Nazis, and 35 years after the war's end, still pursue a kind of "Nazi hunt." But in the same way as the Allies never actually decreed that a civilian National Socialist, whether he be a man, woman or child, should be killed solely on a basis of their National Socialism, in the same way it must also be said that Hitler—in spite of all the antipathy he had toward the Jews—never decreed that all Jews, or even one Jew, should be killed on the sole and unique basis of their Jewishness. Al-

though, in the case of reprisals against "partisans" or "terrorists" when the Germans selected their hostages for execution, it was better to be neither a Jew, nor a Communist, nor a common-law criminal, but in that particular case it was a familiar aspect of hostage-taking (to kill the more expendable hostages) just as had been practiced everywhere throughout the ages.

Hitler had a proportion of the European Jews interned, but in no way does internment mean "extermination." There has been neither "genocide" nor "Holocaust." Every concentration camp is a pitiful sight, and a horror, irrespective of whether it is a German, Russian, British, French, American, Japanese, Chinese, Vietnamese or Cuban camp. There are of course degrees in this pity or this horror, and it is certain that in times of war, of famine, of epidemics, a concentration camp becomes even more horrible. But nothing in the case which concerns us here permits us to say that there were *deliberate camps of extermination*, i.e. camps where people would have been placed to be killed.

The Exterminationists pretend that in the summer of 1941, Hitler gave the order to exterminate the Jews. But no one has ever seen this order. On the other hand, there exist neither specific conversations of Hitler nor measures taken by his armies, which imply that such an order *could not* have been given. On 24 July 1942, in a restricted gathering, Hitler recalled that the Jews had declared war on him through the intermediary of Chaim Weizmann, and said that *after the war* he would close the towns to the Jews, one after the other. His precise words were: ". . . if the Jewish dregs did not decamp and if they do not emigrate to Madagascar or to some other national Jewish homeland."[44] For my own part, I would like to know just how one can reconcile this talk in a circle of confidants with any "definitive order of extermination" supposedly given one year previously (summer 1941).

Even in July 1944, on the eastern front where the German soldiers were engaged in a ferocious war against the partisans (Jews or non-Jews, Russians or Communists, Ukrainians, etc.) the army gave the most draconian orders that no German soldier should participate in any excesses against the civilian population, Jews included. Otherwise, they

would be court-martialled. Such excesses were to be absolutely suppressed. Hitler called for a merciless struggle in the fight, especially against the partisans, including, if it were necessary, against women and children mingling with the partisans or who were apparent accomplices of the partisans. He had evidently not rejected the practice of taking hostages (neither had the Allies, of course). But he did not go beyond that measure. The day our media decide to break with certain taboos and devote to the war crimes of the Allies even one thousandth of the time which they devote to the war crimes of the vanquished, on that day there will be astonishment among the naive public. The "crimes" of Hitler will then take on their correct proportions in a proper historical perspective. There is indeed little talk about Dresden and Katyn. But I say that Dresden and Katyn are small matters when compared to the deportations the Allies inflicted on the German minorities in the eastern territories. It is true that officially it was not a matter of "deportations" but of . . . "displacement" (e.g. "displaced persons"). And I wonder if the champions of all the "war criminals" have not been the British with their delivery to the Soviets of their Russian internees? [46]

QUESTION 4: What is your conception and what is your definition of genocide?

ANSWER 4:

I describe "genocide" as the act of killing a man on account of his race. Hitler no more committed "genocide" than Napoleon, Stalin, Churchill or Mao. Roosevelt interned American citizens of Japanese extraction in concentration camps. That was not "genocide."

Hitler treated the civilian Jews as the representatives of a belligerent enemy minority. It is regrettably common to treat this type of civilian as dangerous, or potentially dangerous. In fact, with good war logic, Hitler would have been lead to intern all the Jews who had fallen into his hands. He is very far from having done this, and without doubt this was not on account of any humanitarian motives, but for reasons of practicality. In certain parts of Europe he made his enemies wear a distinctive sign: the Star of David (beginning Sep-

tember 1941 in Germany, and June 1942 in the northern zone of France). The wearers of the star were not free to move about, except during certain hours. They were like prisoners of war on supervised parole. Hitler preoccupied himself perhaps less with the Jewish question than with ensuring the security of the German soldier. The average German trooper would have been incapable of distinguishing Jews from non-Jews. The Star of David identified them.

The Jews were suspected of passing information (many of them spoke German), of engaging in espionage, of trafficking in arms, of terrorism, and of black-marketeering. It was necessary to avoid all contact between the Jew and the German soldier. For example, on the Paris metro Jews wearing the Star of David were only allowed to ride in the last of the five cars, and a German soldier himself had no right to enter this car.[47] I am not a specialist on these questions but I believe that this kind of measure was dictated by reasons of military security as much as by reasons of deliberate humiliation. In places where there were large concentrations of Jews it was virtually impossible to keep them under surveillance (except through the intermediary of the Jewish ghetto police), and the Germans feared an insurrection similar to that which took place in the Warsaw ghetto, where a strategically dangerous uprising took place in April 1943. With stupefaction, the Germans discovered then that the Jews had constructed 700 blockhouses.[48] They suppressed the insurrection and transferred the survivors to transit camps, work camps, and concentration camps. The Jews experienced tragedy there.

I know that it is sometimes argued that children of 6 to 15 years of age could not constitute a danger, and should not have been subjected to the restrictive measures. But to convince us of the contrary there exist today sufficient accounts and memoirs by Jews telling us of their childhood when they committed all sorts of illicit activities or resistance to the Germans.

It is necessary to distinguish between what is real and what is fantasy in the representation which is made that the Jews allowed themselves to be slaughtered like sheep. Did the non-Jews resist as much as it is said? Did the Jews resist as little as it is said? The factor which increases the problem is

that too many of our judgements are based on a false premise: that of the "genocide" against the Jews. Obviously, if this "genocide" had existed, then one would perhaps regard the Jews as cowards; this is apparently the reproach which young Israelis make against their fathers. But if, as the Revisionists claim, "genocide" is nothing other than a legend, then the reproach of cowardice no longer has a foundation.

QUESTION 5: If there had not been a deliberate intention on the part of Hitler to carry out genocide, then why Auschwitz, Treblinka, Belzec and the other extermination camps? They existed; they have been a reality. Not only Jews have been imprisoned and died there, but also "politicals," gypsies, Slaves, homosexuals; that is to say, all those "deviants" whom Nazi racism condemned. Why were these camps organized? To what ultimate purpose?

ANSWER 5:

A camp can only be qualified as an "extermination" camp if people are exterminated there. It is so true, that, according to the nomenclature created by the official historians, only those camps where (it is pretended) there existed "gas chambers" can be termed "extermination" camps. These camps have never existed. The horrible epidemic of typhus at Bergen-Belsen did not transform this camp (for a great part without barbed-wire) into an extermination camp. Those dead are not the result of a crime except the crime of war itself, and of human folly. The Allies share with the Germans a grave responsibility for the frightful chaos in which Europe, its towns, its refugee camps, and its internee camps, were found at the end of the war. The Allies have distributed a large number of photographs showing the mass graves of Bergen-Belsen. However, thousands of the internees died of typhus after the entry of the British into Bergen-Belsen. At the time the British did not succeed any more than the Germans before them, in ending this terrible epidemic. Would it have been more honest to treat the British as criminals?

The first Nazi concentration camps were conceived for internment and for re-education (*sic!*) of the political opponents to Hitler. Propaganda asserted that these camps, open

to numerous visits, constituted an advance on prisons where common-law criminals stagnated. Jews were interned there only in so far as they were Communists, Social Democrats, etc. The Jews were placed in the concentration camps only during the war, above all from 1942 onward. Those Jews who had been interned in 1938 as a reprisal for the assassination of von Rath by a Jew had been for the most part set free after only a few months.

Before the war, Hitler had attempted—with a certain amount of success—to promote the exodus of the Jews. The idea was the creation of a Jewish national homeland outside Europe. The "Madagascar project" was conceived as a Jewish homeland under German protection.[49] The initial plans provided, as a matter of priority, drainage works, banking systems, etc. But the war prevented the realization of this project.[50] It would have required too many ships. Little Germany—from the aspect of the map of the world—was engaged with Japan and a few allies in a formidable struggle against giants. The principal concern for Germany was to win the war. A secondary aim was to find a solution to the Jewish problem, a definitive solution; a "final" solution, a "total" solution, to a problem which, in a certain manner, was as old as the Jewish people themselves.[51] This provisional solution, because of the war, was largely going to consist of "driving back toward the East" the Jews in the camps.

Auschwitz was first and foremost a very important complex in Upper Silesia composed of three main camps and 39 sub-camps scattered over the whole of one region. The mining, industrial, agricultural operations, and the researches there, were considerable: coal mines (some with French capital), petro-chemicals, armaments, explosives, synthetics, artificial rubber, cattle-breeding, fish farms, etc. At Auschwitz there were free laborers as well as internees, and prisoners condemned to life imprisonment as well as prisoners interned for a shorter time. In Auschwitz-II or Birkenau camp, there was the distressing spectacle of numerous persons unskilled for any work and stagnating on the spot. Among them were the gypsies, who with few exceptions were not put to work. Numerous gypsy children were born at Auschwitz.[52] It seems that only the nomadic gypsies

were interned. This does not seem to have been done for racial reasons, but on account of their nomadism and possible "delinquency." I recall that in France even the Resistance had come to regard the gypsies with suspicion, and had suspected them of espionage, of collecting secret information, and of black market activities.[53] It would be interesting to determine how many gypsy troupes continued to wander around Europe during the war.

As for the homosexuals—classified as delinquents—they were, like many other "delinquents," removed from prison or sent directly to the camps to work there. German legislation, like much other legislation of that epoch, repressed homosexuality. As for the Slavs, those of them who were in the camps were not there because they were Slavs, but as political internees, prisoners of war, etc., as well as other Europeans. At Auschwitz there were even British PoWs, taken prisoner at Tobruk.

The essential pre-occupation of the Germans at the end of 1942 was to put to work *all* these internees (with the exception of those unable to work, and, it seems, the gypsies) to win the war. At Auschwitz there even existed courses of professional training for the young from 12 to 15 years old, in masonry, for example.[54] The Germans responsible for the deportation of foreigners to the camps insisted upon obtaining the largest possible number of those "capable of work." The foreign governments, for their part, insisted that families should not be separated and that the old and the children should join the convoys. Neither the Jews nor anyone else had any knowledge whatever of leaving for an "extermination" camp, if one is to believe testimonies such as those of Georges Wellers in *L'Etoile Jaune à l'heure de Vichy*.[55] They had good reason. This "massacre" was happily nothing but a propaganda invention of the war. Besides, it is difficult to conceive that Germany, dramatically short of locomotives, of wagons, of coal, of qualified personnel, and of soldiers, could have laid on such a system of convoys to the "*abattoirs*." These convoys, I recall, seemed to have had a priority even over the convoys of war materiel.[56] Production, above all, skilled production was what pre-occupied the Germans more than anything in this matter.

QUESTION 6: You have specialized in the literary criticism of texts and documents, but you have made this particular problem your preferred terrain of historical research. Why? What do you wish to say when you continue to assert that there has been a conspiracy of silence concerning the problem of the gas chambers and the extermination of the Jews? Why should a conspiracy of silence exist, and organized by whom?

ANSWER 6:

For me, the critical appraisal of texts and documents aims at establishing the degree of authenticity and veracity of what one reads. One searches therein to distinguish between the true and the false, sense and nonsense, and so on. I suppose that this awareness was destined to guide me to the detection of certain historical fakes, and in particular, to the detection of what in a few years would appear to every historian as a monumental forgery.

The result of the conspiracy of silence surrounding the Revisionist works is that these works are for the most part "samizdat" ("underground literature").[57] In regard to the authors who do succeed in breaking the wall of silence, they are treated as Nazis, which in turn ostracises them to an intellectual ghetto. The procedures utilized against the non-conformist historians or individuals range from pure criminality to judicial prosecutions, without forgetting the disgusting conduct of the police. All sorts of lobbies are active in attempting to establish a dominant atmosphere or terror. I am aware of that personally. I can no longer teach at the university. My life has become difficult. I am up against enormous power-blocs. Some young people support me. The light will eventually shine through. Some Jews are on my side; they themselves wish to denounce deception and persecution.

I believe rather less in conspiracies and rather more in the force of conformity. The victors of the last war needed to make us believe in the intrinsic evil of the vanquished. Soviets and Westerners, whatever their differences, had found common ground of agreement there. Hollywood and the apparatus of Stalinist propaganda have conjugated their efforts. What a fracas of propaganda! The principal be-

neficiaries of the operation have been the state of Israel and international Zionism. The principal victims have been the German people—but not its leaders—and the Palestinian people as a whole. But today there is dissension in the air. Zionists and Poles already present us with a divergent version of Auschwitz.

QUESTION 7: You dispute a very large part of the methods which the official historians have applied in this historical research. In your opinion, this chapter in 20th Century history has not been written in the right way. Why, then? And why would those historians have done so?

ANSWER 7:

The official historians have been lacking in their obligations. They have not observed in this matter the routine methods of historical criticism. They have followed the general current, i.e. that which is sponsored by the media. They have allowed themselves to be absorbed by the system. An official historian such as Professor Hellmut Diwald saw the terrible vexation confronting him when he risked simply writing a phrase saying that "genocide" in spite of the abundant literature dedicated to it, is an affair which in essentials "is not yet well elucidated." Under the pressure of the German Jewish organizations, the second edition of his *History of the Germans* was issued as "re-cast and improved" (*sic!*) where it was necessary. The courage of Paul Rassinier consisted in having precisely applied the routine methods of historical criticism. In a way he has said to his accusers: "Show me your proof." "Does your document offer guarantees of authenticity?" "Are you sure that this expression, that this phrase, has in fact the meaning which you attribute?" "Where do your figures come from?" "How have you reached these statistics?" "Where does the caption of this photo come from?" "Who says to me that this old woman and this child in this picture are really 'on the road to the gas chambers'?" "Does this pile of shoes signify that people were gassed in this camp or that many of those detained there were in fact employed in making shoes?" "Where is the manuscript of this extraordinary testimony which ought to have only one form and which is published in many, contradic-

tory forms, even by one and the same historian?" And so on, and so on.

Paul Rassinier, modest professor of history and geography, has given a remarkable lesson of clairvoyance and of probity to his eminent colleagues of the university. A genuine revolutionary, a genuine member of the Resistance, a genuine deportee, this man loved the truth in the manner it is necessary to love it: fiercely and above anything else. He has denounced what he calls "the lie of Ulysses." Ulysses, as we know, experienced a hundred trials during exile but, returning home, he recounted a thousand. We know that man finds it difficult not to make up yarns. He is often fond of stories of hunting, fishing, love, and wealth. But above all he is fascinated by stories of atrocities.

The American author Arthur R. Butz has written a book on *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. This book provokes disarray among the Exterminationists. The demonstration is unavoidable. The German edition has been placed on the list of "works dangerous to young people," and steps are now being taken to have it banned altogether in West Germany.[58] The German Wilhelm Stäglich has published *Der Auschwitz Mythos (The Auschwitz Myth)*. The Swedish group Jewish Information has published *Auschwitz Exit*. A Jew has written Revisionist works: J. G. Burg in Germany. In very recent times, the extreme left review *La Guerre Sociale (The Class War)* has published a study entitled "From exploitation in the camps to the exploitation of the camps."[59] In Britain, in the United States, in Germany (in this particular country the persecution of Revisionists is merciless), in Australia, in Belgium, in Spain, in France, almost in every part of the world, voices are raised demanding that this absurd war propaganda be finally renounced.

I even know—although I cannot give here their names—of official historians who have awakened from this nightmare. Perhaps they wish to decide to renounce the delights which the Revisionist historian David Irving calls "incest among historians." This figurative expression illustrates the practice which consists of delighting in reassessing what other historians have affirmed and of not reviving the subject except by subtle outbidding. It is instructive to participate in a

congress of historians dealing with Nazism. What strange communion in respect of a taboo! Misfortune to those who wish to disturb the expiatory ceremony by the expression of a non-official theme: derision and censure.[60]

QUESTION 8: Are you an anti-Semite? What is your assessment of Nazism?

ANSWER 8:

I am not anti-Semitic. One must avoid imagining anti-Semites everywhere. Those Jews who denounce the imposture of "genocide" are like Catholics who say Fatima is an imposture (where thousands of witnesses are supposed to have seen the sun dance). The truth, or its research, cannot be anti-Semitic. In fact Nazism was the dictatorship of a Führer. It died with the Führer on 30 April 1945. My enemy is vanquished. Do not count on me to spit upon his corpse. As long as I am a man, I will not accept that the German people should be defamed by attributing to them crimes which are without precedent in human history. And above all, I will not accept that the German people are so thoroughly "re-educated" that they are the first to believe in these crimes, and deprecate themselves even more than their leaders require of them. In my capacity as an historian, I merely state that Adenauer, Brandt and Schmidt repeat the lessons they have learned from the conquerors of the West, while their homologs in East Germany repeat the lessons taught them by their conquerors from the East. It is realpolitik, I suppose.

QUESTION 9: You deny also that the number of victims—six million—is credible. But even if the number of victims had been less, does this change anything in the fact that there was genocide? And would the number of victims matter, in fact?

ANSWER 9:

The six million is equivalent to a population of a country like Switzerland. No one at the Nürnberg Trial had the tiniest scrap of evidence capable of backing up such a figure. It was on the morning of 14 December 1945 that the American prosecutor Walsh attempted to insinuate the acceptance of this figure by means of presenting an affidavit by witness

Wilhel Höttl. That very afternoon he was forced to beat a retreat by the intervention of the lawyer Kauffmann, who decisively demanded the appearance of this witness so that he could be cross-examined in regard to this figure. The sad fact is that the press and the historians have retained this figure as if the tribunal had totally believed it. [61]

My estimation is as follows: First, the number of Jews exterminated by the Nazis (or: "victims of genocide") is happily equivalent to zero. Second, the number of Europeans killed by acts of war (often by atrocious acts of war) could be in the order of 40 millions; among them the proportion of European Jews could be somewhere in the order of one million, but more likely, several hundred thousands if one does not count those Jews fighting in the uniforms of military allies. I insist on the fact that, as far as I am concerned, it is an estimate without proper scientific character. Moreover, I have good enough reason to think that the figure of the dead at Auschwitz (Jews and non-Jews) amounts to around 50,000 and not to 4 million, as has been pretended for a long time. (This was before the Institute of Contemporary History in Munich decided to content themselves with one million as the accepted figure.)

As to the number of dead in all the concentration camps from 1933 to 1945, I think that it ought to be 200,000 or, at the most, 360,000. One day I will cite my sources, but today I assert that, if one employs computers, one can without doubt quickly establish the real number of dead. The deportees were indexed in files by many authorities. They left behind much evidence.

QUESTION 10: Do you realize that you can contribute this toward a "rehabilitation" of Nazism?

ANSWER 10:

Is it rehabilitating Nero if it is said that we do not possess any proof that he set Rome on fire? What one must concern oneself with rehabilitating or re-establishing is the truth! (Or at least, whenever it is possible.) The historian ought not to preoccupy himself with how Peter or Paul is going to react. What is important for me is to make my contribution to a truthful history of the Second World War. If an old Nazi happened to say to me that the pretended "gas chambers"

and the pretended "genocide" of the Jews constitute one and the same unique historical lie, I would agree with him as much as if he had told me that two and two make four. I would not go further, and I would leave him to his political ideas.

Neo-Nazism is to a large extent an invention of the media who even sell a kind of Hollywood sex-shop Nazism. This is also the case with the imaginary "Odessa File" or the Nazi colonies in South America. Or the fairy-tale reappearances of Hitler or Bormann. A lot of money is made through these inventions. In Germany, I believe that those whom their political adversaries classify as "Neo-Nazi" form 0.7 percent of the electorate. We live in a fantasmagoria, in a sort of Nazism without Nazis. About this subject, I would refer to the pertinent analyses of Gilbert Comte which appeared in *Le Monde* 29 and 30 May 1979. Since nothing happens by accident in this world, it is plain that an examination of this "media hype" reveals a complex play of interests, passions, and conflicts, all on a planetary scale. The state of Israel has a vital interest in the maintenance of this fantasmagoria, which contributed so much to its creation in 1948. Even a state such as the French republic has an interest in masking the reality of all of this, thanks to upholding in everyone's mind a vigilance against the worst enemy who ever existed: the well-known vile beast of Nazism, a beast which died 35 years ago and against which it is permitted to let off steam. Consequently you have those perpetual expiatory ceremonies, those condemnations to eternal flames, this necessity of vengeance, of chastisement, of denunciation without any limit of time, of place, or of person.

QUESTION 11: Don't you think that to treat the problem of Jewish genocide in such a manner is a way to discredit the memories upon which the widespread conviction is principally based that anti-Semitism is the worst of all the racism practiced in the course of the 20th Century? Memories which are discredited in fact serve nothing.

ANSWER 11:

Anti-Semitism is not the worst kind of racism, but a good way of making us believe that it is, is to convince us that "genocide" was practiced against the Jews. However, the

Zionists have gone too far. They should have listened to those who counselled against the principle of "financial reparations" imposed on Germany in the name, particularly, of "genocide." Unfortunately, Ben Gurion for the state of Israel and Nahum Goldmann, acting at the same time for Israel and the Diaspora, wished to draw a gigantic financial profit from the whole affair. Adenauer was a party to it. That gives the imposture of "genocide" an even more outrageous coloration. Read the stupefying interview of Nahum Goldmann which appeared in number 624 of *Nouvel Observateur* (25-29 October 1976).[62] One has rarely seen a man so elated and happy at having succeeded in a splendid financial-political operation.

QUESTION 12: In the course of your dispute with all those who contest this thesis, you have also asserted that a good part of what the public knows is only a legend and that this legend has been rendered possible thanks to the indiscriminate use of the mass media. What exactly do you wish to say by this?

ANSWER 12:

This point is grave and fascinating. The responsibility of the media in all of this is overwhelming. For 35 years, on five continents, this legend of "genocide" and "gas chambers" has been presented to us as a truth. Countless millions of people have been abused in this way . It makes one dizzy. What a lesson for those who believe in the quality of diverse and contradictory information! It has needed the heroic struggle of some individuals, of some non-conformist spirits in order to make a rupture in "official" truth. I could write a long study on the methods used by the French newspapers and television in order to stifle information. The courts help them in this, and also the public authorities as a whole. Journalists are afraid that in the near future a data bank of information will be installed. This information would result in a classification of news items, which they would scarcely have means to control. But I have some advice for them. If they wish to know what a risk they are running of being deceived, let them look to the past, and—for some of them—at their own past. If they wish to know how lies may look in the future, let them study the way in which the most remarkable lie of all time has been jealously guarded. When Louis

XIV lied, his lies scarcely reached beyond a few provinces. Today, lies can take on veritable Hollywoodian dimensions. A "docudrama" like *Holocaust* is the crowning of an edifice. It was not conceivable in the years which followed the war, and which were indeed full of hatred. It has needed thirty years of intoxication. A drug as strong as *Holocaust* cannot be administered except to patients already long impregnated with other drugs of the same kind and which automatically require even more virulent drugs. But the overdose has produced some salutory effects through the spectacle of our addiction. Some sane reactions have been noticed. I am thinking in particular of the quite remarkable reactions by the "liberated Jew" Michel Rachline in an issue of *Le Figaro* (3 March 1979).

The non-existence of the "gas chambers" and of "genocide" is good news. Man, although still capable of many horrors, did not bring about these. And even better: millions of men who have been presented to us as accomplices of a monstrous crime or as cowards or as liars have been in fact decent individuals. I have already said that the Jews accused by their children of being driven like sheep into the *abattoirs* by the Germans do not in fact merit the accusation. I would add that the defendants at Nürnberg and at a thousand other trials were actually telling the truth when they declared to their accusing judges that they did not know of these terrifying massacres. The Vatican and the Red Cross told the truth when they humbly confessed the same ignorance. The Americans, the British, the Swiss, the Swedes, and all those peoples or governments whom the extremist Jews accused of "having done nothing" no longer have any need to show sinful repentance. The most unfortunate result of this gigantic imposture has been, and will still remain for some time to come, the bad conscience which the extremist Jews created among the western peoples, and in particular among the German people. Above all, I do not wish to give the impression that I am in the least making an apology for Nazism. I would even argue that I am capable of presenting a caustically critical analysis of this type of ideology. But I shall not present this analysis so long as the Exterminationists continue to wear us to death with this fake Nazism which continues to be denounced by the majority of official historians. These people, in attacking a Nazism

which never existed, give the impression that they are incapable of attacking the reality of Nazism. They make me think of those people who imagine evil as a Devil with his tenterhooks, his pales, and his ovens. In reality, evil, as we well know, is inherent in the life-styles which man has created. So long as we take on mythical forms of evil, genuine evil will continue to be fighting fit. Our society is disconcerted. The medieval Devil has been re-invented right in the middle of the Twentieth Century. People are combating an imaginary enemy. They have better to do. An effort at analysis is necessary. We should open our eyes and recognize what the mass media have made us into. We should unmask that which lobbies, powers and governments seek to mask everywhere.

Footnotes

1. This absurd legend (consult an anatomist, a chemist, any kind of specialist about it) has been revived but without any great success, in the course of the Second World War. Gitta Sereny makes mention of it in her book *Into That Darkness: From Mercy Killing to Mass Murder*, London, Andre Deutsch, 1974, 380pp. She says in a footnote of page 141 "The universally accepted story that the corpses were used to make soap and fertilizer is finally refuted by the generally very reliable Ludwigsburg Central Authority for Investigation into Nazi Crimes." She adds: "The authority has found after considerable research that only one experiment was made, with 'a few corpses from a concentration camp. When it proved impractical, the idea was apparently abandoned.' " The authority she talks about is "die Zentrale Stelle der Landesjustizverwaltangen zur Aufklärung NS-Verbrechen." It operates at Ludwigsburg under the direction of Adalbert Rückerl, a convinced Exterminationist. It would be interesting to get proof of "that only one experiment." Most of the time, when a big lie is revealed, the liars or their sympathizers say that there was only a mistake, and they then put forward to us a little lie. I suppose that "that only one experiment" could be one of these little lies.

In *The Journal of Historical Review* of Summer 1980, Ditlieb Felderer makes some interesting remarks about "human soap." He says: "Immediately after liberation, in Polticeni, a Romanian town, the district rabbi ordered all soaps to be collected which had the letters RIF written on them. With much weeping and wailing, while the rabbi muttered his Kaddisch prayer, the soaps

were then buried in a cemetery. The news report about this incident was later published in the Polish press, and was picked up in books such as F. C. Weiskopf's *Elend und Grosse unserer Tage*, 1950. The letters RIF actually stand for "Reichsstelle fur Industrielle Fettsversorgung," a German Government outlet which oversaw the production of soap and detergent products. These letters were, however, twisted by the Exterminationists to mean 'Clean Jewish Fat' (*Rein Judisches Fett*)." The article was previously printed in *Auschwitz Exit*, which is obtainable from Ditlieb Felderer, Marknadsvagen 289, S-183, 34 Taby, Sweden.

If one must believe Pierre Joffroy, "bars of Jewish soap" are today found buried in the Jewish cemetery at Haifa, Israel. Pierre Joffroy, in an article about Anne Frank, stated:

> these four bars of "Jewish soap" manufactured from corpses in the extermination camps and which, discovered in Germany, were wrapped in a shroud, in 1948, and piously buried according to the rites in a corner of a Haifa cemetery (Israel).
>
> *Paris-Match*, No. 395, 3 November 1956, p93.

In 1943, representatives of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (founded in Moscow in 1942) toured the United States in order to raise political, and—above all—material, aid from the U.S.A. for the USSR. The two month trip raised more than two million dollars. Big meetings were held in many American cities. "At each of the meetings, (Salomon) Mikhoels showed the public a bar of soap made out of Jewish flesh, and taken from a concentration camp." ("A chacune des réunions qui se tenaient, Mikhoels [qui était un prodigieux acteur] montrait au public une savonnette faite avec de la chair humaine juive et remenée d'un camp de concentration"; Gèrard Israel, *Jid/Les Juifs en URSS*, Paris, Editions Spéciale, (Jean-Claude Lattès), 1971, p203). I acknowledge Mark Weber, from Arlington, Virginia, for presenting me with this information.

2. Study this U.S. Army photo which has been spread all over the world and which Arthur R. Butz reproduces on page 191 of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Institute for Historical Review, 1979.

3. "(. . .) fur die Degesch vom 20. Juni ab vom Reichspatentamt patentiert." (*Justiz und NS-Verbrechen*, Amsterdam, University Press, vol. XIII (1975), p137).

4. "Un gaz contre les renards" ("A gas against foxes"), *Le Quotidien de Paris*, 2 September 1977. See also a review devoted to hunting: *Le Saint-Hubert*, April 1979, pp180-181, "Methodes de réduction de la population vulpine" ("Méthods of reducing the fox population").

5. I cannot actually provide definitive proof of what I put forward here. I have discovered this point in the archives of the CDJC in Paris, where I have been refused admittance since January 1978, on account of my historical findings.

6. This expression seems to have been created by the Swedish research group based at Täby and headed by Ditlieb Felderer. See note 1 on their work and on the lie of Auschwitz entitled *Auschwitz Exit*.

7. Among deceptive titles one can cite that of Pierre Serge Choumoff, *Les Chambres à gaz de Mauthausen* (The Gas Chambers of Mauthausen), Amicale des Déportés et Familles de Disparus du Camp de Concentration de Mauthausen (Association of Mauthausen Victims), 31 Boulevard Saint-Germain, Paris 5e, 1971, 96pp.

8. Georges Wellers, "La 'Solution Finale de la Question Juive' et la mythomanie néo-nazie" ("The 'Final Solution' of the Jewish Question and the neo-Nazi Mythomania"), *Le Monde Juif*, No. 86 April-June 1977, pp41-84. Translated into English, this article carries the title, "Reply to the Neo-Nazi Falsification of Historical Facts Concerning the Holocaust"; it is reproduced on pages 105-162 of a work published in 1978 by the Beate Klarsfeld Foundation of New York, with the title: *The Holocaust and the Neo-Nazi Mythomania*, XVIII-215pp.

9. The camp at Auschwitz had three successive commandants: Rüdolf Hoss, Arthur Liehehenschel and Richard Baer. The first had been interrogated by the British, and then by the Poles, who executed him. The second was executed by the Poles. The third died suddenly in prison when the famous "Auschwitz Trial" at Frankfurt (1963-65) was in preparation. On their own, the Poles seem to have interrogated and passed judgement on 617 persons (Nazis or allies of the Nazis) in connection with the question of Auschwitz. This figure is given by Hermann Langbein on page 993 of *Der Auschwitz Prozess (The Auschwitz Trial)*, Europa Verlag, Vienna, 1965, 2 vols. On their part, the French, the British, and the Americans have often interrogated or passed judgement on former

Auschwitz guards. It is surprising that there has emanated such a derisory amount of information on the pretended massacres in "gas chambers" from such an enormous number of interrogations and trials. To my knowledge there has been no mention of "admissions," or even of any kind of information, on the part of Liebehenschel or Baer on the "gas chambers." The true "Gas Chambers Trial" of Auschwitz has been—one can never repeat it enough—that of the architects Walter Dejaco and Fritz Ertl at Vienna (Austria) in 1972. This trial, launched by Simon Wiesenthal and presented as a sensational affair, very quickly became a fiasco for the prosecution. The two men having been charged with having "constructed and repaired gas chambers and crematorium ovens at Auschwitz-Birkenau," revealed, I suppose, as established technicians, that even if they had constructed or had had constructed the crematoria ovens, they most certainly had *not* designed plans of "gas chambers" but only for the morgues which flanked these crematoria ovens. The two architects were acquitted.

10. *Kommandant in Auschwitz / Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen (Commandant of Auschwitz / Autobiographical Notes)* by Rudolf Höss, introduction and commentary by Martin Broszat, 1958, Verlagsanstalt, Stuttgart. It is on page 166 of this book, in the part of the confession which Höss had drawn up in November 1946, where the following passage is found: "Eine halbe Stunde nach den Einwurf des Gasses worde die Tur geoffnet and die Entluftungsanlage eingeschaltet. Es worde sofort mit dem Herausziehen der Leichen begonnen." ("Half an hour after the gas had been thrown in, the door was opened and the ventilating apparatus switched on. The removal of the bodies was begun immediately.") And it is on page 126 of the book, in the excerpt dated February 1947, that it is said that the squad charged with the responsibility of removing the corpses from the "gas chambers" did this labor "mit einer stumpfer Gleichmütigkeit" ("with a gloomy indifference") as if it were a matter of some kind of everyday chore ("als wenn es irgend etwas Alltäglisches wäre"). Höss is supposed to have added: "Beim Leichenschleppen assen sie oder rauchten." That is to say: "While pulling out [the cadavers] they used to eat or smoke." For Höss, moreover, they would not cease eating. They would eat when pulling the cadavers out of the chambers, when extracting the gold teeth, when cutting off the hair, when dragging them toward the furnaces or pits. Höss even adds this outrageous remark: "At the pits they used to keep the fire going. They would pour accumulated molten fat over the new cadavers, and they would poke around in the mountains of burning

bodies to create a flue."

Höss does not reveal to us how the fat managed not to be burnt itself (corpses cannot be *spit-roasted* as if they were chickens, but they are *reduced to bones and ashes* in heaps piled up on the ground or in the form of pyres). He does not tell us how the men could approach these formidable pyres to collect the streams of fat (!), neither does he tell us how they could get close enough to poke around in these mountains of bodies to effect a flue. The absurdity of this "pouring accumulated fat" ("das Übergiessen des angesammelten Fettes") is moreover so evident that the French translator of the book presented by Martin Broszat has quite discreetly omitted to translate those five German words (Rudolf Höss, *Le Commandant d'Auschwitz parle (The Commandant of Auschwitz Speaks)*, translated from German to French by Constantin de Grunwald, Paris, Julliard, 1959, printing of 15 March 1970, p212. Filip Müller has written *Sonderbehandlung*, translated as *Eyewitness Auschwitz / Three Years in the Gas Chambers*, New York, Stein & Day, 1979, XIV-180pp. From page 132 to 142 he accumulates the most astonishing stories about boiling human fat running like water, collecting pans for the fat, sizzling fat scooped out with buckets on a long curved rod and poured all over the pit, the SS guard Moll flinging live babies into the boiling human fat, and so on.

11. For the various trials generally called "Nürnberg Trials" the Americans have perused many technical documents concerning Zyklon B. If they had read these documents carefully, and if they had—as I did myself—continued further research in certain technical tomes in the Library of Congress, Washington, DC, they would have become aware of the incredible number of technical impossibilities contained in the German "gas chamber" evidence. One day I will devote a study to four specific documents which, in my opinion, completely destroy the legend of the "gas chambers." Those four documents are: first, two documents recorded by the Americans for the Nürnberg Trials, and then, two technical studies signed by Gerhard Peters; all of which one may consult at the Washington Library of Congress. I recall that Gerhard Peters was, during the war, the temporary director of the firm DEGESCH (Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Schädlingsbekämpfung: German Company for Pest Control) which controlled in particular the distribution of Zyklon B. After the war, Gerhard Peters was to be brought before the courts many times by his own compatriots. He said he had never heard during the war about any homicidal use of Zyklon B.

Nürnberg documents (documents with the prefix NI, which means Nuremberg, Industrialists):

a) NI-9098, recorded only on 25 July 1947: a brochure entitled *Acht Vorträge aus dem Arbeitgebiet der DEGESCH (Eight lectures on aspects of DEGESCH's Field of Operation) and printed in 1942 for private usage. At the end of this brochure, page 47, there appears a descriptive table on each of the eight gases distributed by the firm. At point number 7 of the description one reads for Zyklon B:* "*Luftbarkeit:* wegen starken Haftvermogens des Gases am Oberflaschen erschwert und langwierig." ("*Ventilation Properties:* complicated and long to ventilate since the gas adheres strongly to surfaces.")

b) NI-9912, recorded only on 21 August 1947: a public notice entitled *Richtlinien fur die Anwendung von Blausäure (Zyklon) zur Ungeziefervertilgung (Entwesung) (Directives for the use of Prussic Acid (Zyklon) for the Destruction of Vermin (Disinfestation).).* This document is of capital importance. Better than any other it shows at what point the handling of Zyklon B can only be done by trained personnel. The time required for the product to destroy vermin ranges from 6 hours in hot times, to 32 hours during cold periods. The normal duration is 16 hours. This long duration is explained undoubtedly by the composition of Zyklon. Zyklon is prussic acid, or hydrocyanic acid, absorbed by a support of diatomite. The gas is released slowly because of the nature of its support. This slowness is such that one cannot understand how on earth the Germans could have chosen a gas such as Zyklon in order to liquidate masses of human beings. It would have been easier for them to have utilized hydrocyanic acid in its liquid form. They had at their disposal significant quantities of this acid in the laboratories of the IG-Farben plant at Auschwitz, where they tried to make synthetic rubber. It is from document NI-9912 that I draw the information concerning the employment of Zyklon B for the fumigation of a barracks, the duration of aeration (at least 21 hours), et cetera.

Documents at the Library of Congress. These concern two technical studies written by Gerhard Peters and both were published in *Sammlung Chemischer & Chemisch-technischer Vorträge*, the first in 1933 in Neue Folge, Heft 20, and the other in Neue Folge, Heft 47a in 1942, (review edited by Ferdinand Enke at Stuttgart). Here are the titles, followed by the Library of Congress reference:

a) "Blausäure zur Schädlingsbekämpfung" (QD1, S2, n.f., hft.20, 1933), 75pp.

b) "Die hochwirksamen Gase und Dämpfe in der Schädlingsbekämpfung" (QD1, S2, n.f., hft.47a, 1942), 143pp. It should be said in passing that it is admirable that this review which was published during the war in Germany should have arrived safely also during the war at the Library of Congress in Washington! The 1942 issue bears the Washington registration date of . . . 1 April 1944!

12. French regulations concerning the use of hydrocyanic acid are as strict as the German. See the decree 50-1290 of 18 October 1950 from the Ministry of Public Health, Paris.

13. The plan which allows us to give these dimensions to the nearest centimeter is found in the archives of the State Museum of Oswiecim (Auschwitz). The reference number of this photo of the plan is Neg. 519. The plans of the "Kremas" (crematoria) IV and V are even more interesting than those of Kremas II and III. They prove, in effect, that the three structures abusively described as "gas chambers" were in fact inoffensive premises, complete with ordinary doors and windows. The sole means for the SS to "throw in the Zyklon" into these places "from the exterior" would have been the following scenario: The SS would have had to have requested their victims—piled up in hundreds or thousands in a space of only 236m2—to open the windows for them to "throw in the Zyklon" after which the victims would carefully close the windows again, and abstain from smashing the window panes, until death ensued.78 It is perfectly easy to understand why the Polish Communist authorities are so reluctant to display these plans; they prefer to rely on the Höss "confessions" with no supporting topographical data.

14. These interesting remains of the crematoria can be seen behind a large glass in the back room which, in the exhibition block No. 24, is devoted to the Kremas.

15. These details of the first execution by toxic gas were published in the Belgian *Le Soir* of 9 February 1974, under the rubric "50 Years Ago": a reprint of an article from the 9 February 1924 edition of the same paper.

16. The summary which I give here of an execution by hydrocyanic acid is inspired by an inquiry which an American lawyer kindly conducted for me on six penitentiaries and on a firm manufacturing gas chambers. The penitentiaries are as follows: San Quentin, California; Jefferson City, Missouri; Santa Fe, New

Mexico; Raleigh, North Carolina; Baltimore, Maryland; and Florence, Arizona. The firm is Eaton Metal Products Company of Denver, Colorado. It is obvious that there are variations in the method from one penitentiary to another. I have personally obtained authorization to visit one of these gas chambers. The "Gas Chamber Procedure Sheet" reveals that the simple preparation of the chamber for an execution demands two days' work for two employees, occupying eight hours work per day each. Once the chamber is ready, the operation itself goes through 47 stages. This procedure sheet comes nowhere near describing the complications of each of the 47 tasks. Let us take as an example: "Empty Chamber (Body Removed)." In actuality, these words signify the following: the doctor and his two assistants must, after waiting the stipulated time, enter the room wearing gas masks, rubber aprons and rubber gloves; the doctor must tousle the hair of the dead man to expel the molecules of hydrocyanic acid which may have remained there; the two assistants must carefully wash the body with a hose; they must in particular wash the mouth and all the other apertures of the body; they must not forget to carefully wash the bend of the elbows and the bend of the knees. Just a glance at one of these small gas chambers, constructed in order to kill a single condemned man, renders ridiculous those premises of stone wood, and plaster which are represented as being former German "gas chambers." If the American gas chambers are made exclusively of steel and glass, then it is for reasons of good sense and for reasons more specifically technical. The first reason is that the acid has a tendency to adhere to the surface and even to penetrate certain materials, so therefore it is necessary to avoid such materials. The second reason is that, when the ventilators empty the chamber of air, there is a risk of implosion, so therefore the structure has remarkably thick walls of steel and glass. The very heavy steel door can only be closed with a handwheel.

17. The Polish Communists themselves recognize that the tattooing had as its aim the hindering of flight, and the facilitating of identifying captured escapees. See: *Contribution à l'histoire du KL-Auschwitz*, Musée d'Etat d'Auschwitz, 1968, p16 and p99.

18. Louis De Jong, *Viertelsjahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, Munich, 1969, Heft 1, pp1-16: "Die Niederlande und Auschwitz" (The Netherlands & Auschwitz"'). Sensitive to the delicate nature of these kinds of revelations, the director of the review, H. Rothfels, explains in a foreword the reason why he has consented to publish this study. The reason is that Louis De Jong, not being a German, could not possibly be suspected of being an apologist for National

Socialism; on the contrary, as director of an official institute like that in Amsterdam, he had given all desirable pledges of his seriousness. This preface gives some idea of the situation in which German historians find themselves. There are certain truths which they cannot utter without being suspected of being apologists for Nazism. It is also important to note that Mr. Louis De Jong is even less suspect because he is of Jewish origin.

19. These aerial photographs have been revealed to the general public by Dino A. Brugioni and Robert G. Poirer in a pamphlet entitled *The Holocaust Revisited.* Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, Washington, DC, ST 79-10001, 19pp. The booklet is somewhat curious in that it was researched in the authors' free time, not during CIA time, and this is the reason why the authors cannot enter into any correspondence regarding the contents! The two authors offer an interesting example of blindness. They attempt at all costs to adapt the photographic reality with what they believe to have been the reality of Auschwitz, according to three Exterminationist works. There is a spectacular contradiction between the photos and the commentaries which they attach.

20. Article 19 of the Statue of the International Military Tribunal states: "The Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence [. . .]." Article 21 states: "The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge but shall take judicial notice thereof [. . .]."

21. *Prison et déportation*, Paris, Spes, 1947, p77.

22. The pretended "gas chamber" of Dachau today bears the following inscription worded in five languages (German, English, French, Italian, Russian):
GASKAMMER getarnt als "Brausebad" — *war nicht in Betrieb*
GAS CHAMBER disguised as a "shower room" — *never used*
CHAMBRE A GAZ "chambre de douche" camouflée — *ne fut jamais utilisée*

I have asked Frau Barbara Distel, director of the Dachau Museum, and Dr. Guerisse, president of the International Committee of Dachau, headquartered at Brussels, what induced them to describe an incomplete premises as a "gas chamber"; because one wonders how it is possible to know that an unfinished building is due to become, once achieved, something no one has ever seen in his life! Equally, I wished to ascertain if expert technical, scientific, foren-

sic, or legal opinions were consulted about these premises. On this second point the reply was in the negative. On the first point I received no reply at all. Does not every visitor to Dachau have the right to have clarification there and then? Has not every German the right to demand proof from his accusers, in support of their terrible accusation? For it is indeed a terrible accusation to suggest that such and such a person had constructed an abominable instrument with the *intention* of killing human beings in a sort of human abattoir.

23. See "Réflexions sur l'étude de la déportation" (Reflections on the Study of Deportation") by Germaine Tillion, in the special issue entitled "Le Système concentrationnaire allemand 1940-1944" ("The German Concentration Camp System 1940-1944") of *the Revue d'Histoire de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale* (*Review of WWII History*) of July 1954. Consult pages 16,17,20,21,24,26, and especially note 2 of page 17, note 2 of page 18 and note 1 of page 20.

24. Document of Nürnberg "Paris/Storey" PS-3870: declaration under oath of policeman Hans Marsalek. According to the policeman, the conditions under which Ziereis had admitted the existence and functioning of a "gas chamber" at Mauthausen ought to be reflected upon. The "interrogation" was in fact a pure and simple torture session which lasted from six to eight hours until Ziereis gave up the ghost. The policeman himself stated that he had conducted the interrogation of the commandant for six to eight hours during the night of 22/23 May 1945. He said that Franz Ziereis was gravely wounded; that three bullets had passed through his body and that he knew he was going to die. Today in the museum of Mauthausen one can see a photo taken by flash and which shows Ziereis still alive, while seated near him an internee listens to his words. There are other people in the photo at the bedside of the dying man: possibly General Seibel, commander of the 11th American armored division; and the former doctor of the internees, the deportee Dr. Koszeinski, were there, as the policeman affirmed. That a divisional general and a professional doctor have admitted participating in this torture session reflects greatly on the mentality of those who prized having a "Nazi" in their hands: a "Nazi" is not a man, but a sort of malevolent beast. One can be sure that all the commandants of all the camps were thus regarded. Therefore, the "admissions" which they made or are said to have made are not astonishing. Most of these "admissions" are "Depositions Under Oath" or "Statements" written in English,

signed by an Allied officer, who adds: "I hereby certify that I have accurately translated this deposition from English into German to the said deponent ———————————— [here the name of the German interrogatee is inserted] and that he [the German] fully agrees the contents thereof." See document D-746(a), D-749(b), etc.

25. "Keine Vergasung in Dachau" ("No Gassing in Dachau"), letter by Dr. Martin Broszat, *Die Zeit*, 19 August 1960, p16 (in the German edition). In the U.S.A. edition: 26 August 1960, p14.

26. See the words, which I quote above, in my note 10. Dr. Martin Broszat explains in note 1 of page 167 why he does not give the continuation of Höss's text. He says that, in this sequence, Höss delivers to us "completely confused data," ("völlig abwegige Angaben") that he passes off information "which definitely could not be taken seriously" ("müssen diese Mitteilungen als gänzlich unzuverlässig getten"). Dr. Broszat gives an example of one of these aberrations, but he is careful to choose one of the least distorted of them. Fifteen years after the publication of his book, the Poles, in their turn, gave what it is convenient to call the text of Höss's confessions. And it is here that, for once, one perceives that the "aberrations" were multiplied under the pen of Höss. In order to get some idea, one must refer to the following work: *KL-Auschwitz in den Augen der SS (Auschwitz Concentration Camp As Seen By* the SS) Auschwitz Museum, Cracow, 1973, pp135-136. Dr. Broszat has been disqualified in the eyes of all serious historians by his publishing the "Höss Confessions." With just a little attention and honesty, Broszat ought to have concluded that this "confession" is a mass of absurdities and aberrations, which can only have been dictated to Höss by his Polish Stalinist jailers.

27. The expression employed by Dr. Broszat is "above all" ("vor allem"). This rather embarrassed expression seems to me to have been used because Broszat did not wish to make pronouncements on the authenticity or otherwise of the "gas chambers" which are neither in Poland nor in the Old Reich, i.e. Mauthausen in Austria, and Struthof in Alsace.

28. In an all too familiar fashion with this subject matter, Dr. Broszat looked perhaps as if he attempted to back-pedal on his original courageous statement of 19 August 1960. He has written, or has had written by his Institute staff, letters or articles where he appears on the surface to retract his *Die Zeit* statement. In reality, in studying the texts closely, one gets the impression that Dr. Broszat

is merely paying lip service to any retraction, and is still sticking to what he wrote in 1960. See the following texts:

a) Reply of Frau Dr. S. Noller on 26 October 1967 to *Paris-Match* journalist Pierre Joffroy. This reply is published in part in the book by Pierre Serge Choumoff (pp73-74) which I mentioned in note 7.

b) Preface by Dr. Broszat to a study by Frau Dr. Ino Arndt and Dr. Wolfgang Scheffler which appeared in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* April 1976 and entitled: "Organinierter Massenmord an Juden in NS-Vernichtungslagern" ("Organized Mass Murder of Jews in Nazi Extermination Camps"), pp105-135; preface: pp105-112).

c) Reply of Frau Dr. Ino Arndt on 25 November 1977 to Professor Egon G. L. Rieder. This reply was published by MUT-Verlag, January 1979. (Address: 3901 Asendorf, West Germany).

29. On Treblinka, as well as on Belzec, Sobibor and Chelmno, see *NS-Vernichtungslager im Spiegel deutscher Strafprozesse (Nazi Extermination Camps Reflected in German Courts)*, by Adalbert Rückerl, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, original edition 1977. Adalbert Rückerl and the Exterminationists are not lucky with Treblinka. They say that in Treblinka there were "gas chambers." Many books give some details about them. As a matter of fact, all those people forget the Nürnberg document PS-3311: according to this "Certificate" of 5 December 1945, the mass killing was done by suffocation in steam-filled chambers!

30. *Le Système concentrationnaire nazi (1933-1945) (The Nazi Concentration Camp System (1933-1945)*, thesis, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1968, pp541-544.

31. Höss had been tortured. It is from the Poles themselves that we know this. They authorized him to say this in his confession. There might have been several motives for this authorization on the part of instructing judge Jan Sehn. As Höss indulged in praises of the kindness of his jailers at Cracow, it may well be that Sehn wished to give us the idea that, if Höss had previously come out with absurdities because of his torture by the British, then on this occasion, in Cracow prison, he was expressing himself with complete freedom. In his "ingenuousness" in admitting everything they wanted to his British torturers, Höss had gone so far as to speak

of the "extermination camp" of "Wolzek near to Lublin." However, Wolzek never existed, neither near to Lublin nor anywhere in Poland. Höss, however, cited this mythical camp in document NO-1210 of 14 March 1946, then in document PS-3868 of 5 April 1946, and also in document NI-034 of 20 May 1946. Out of terrible embarrassment, an attempt has been made to pretend that Belzec is this "Wolzec camp," which is in itself absurd, since in document PS-3868 Hoss precisely states that there were "three other extermination camps in the General Government: Belzek (sic), Treblinka, and Wolzek" ("drei weitere Vernichtungslager in Generalgouvernment: Belzek, Treblinka und Wolzek"). This absurb solution ("Wolzek is Belzec"!) has been imposed by the "Bible" of the Exterminationists' research: *The Holocaust / The Nuremberg Evidence* (Part One: Documents) edited by Yad Vashem in Jerusalem and at the YIVO Institute in New York, 1976 (see p544). A solution even less acceptable has been proposed by the attorney Adalbert Rückerl in note 5 of pages 37/38 of the work which I quote above in my note 29. This lawyer has no qualms about saying that Wolzek is in reality . . . Sobibor! It would be endless work to quote all the aberrations contained in the papers that the British military justice made Höss sign. To take only one other example here, Höss said that there was situated at Treblinka an installation for gassing by "gasmobiles" (mobile gas-trucks, or gas-vans) which he later sited at Chelmno! The British made him say "Treblinka" (NO-1210 & PS-3868) whereas the Poles made him say "Culmhof" (NO-4498-B). However, the distance as the crow flies is nearly 250km between Treblinka, which is to the east of Warsaw, and Kulmhof (or Culmhof or Chelmno-on-Ner), which is to the north-west of Warsaw. Therefore, Jan Sehn authorized his prisoner to enlighten us at the manner in which he had been treated before enjoying the comforts of Cracow prison. The British seriously mishandled him, Höss says, even up to the point where he was forced to sign a statement, the contents of which he did not understand. He begins by writing this in his confession to the Poles at Cracow: "Es worde mir übel zugesetz durch die Field-Security-Police" ("I was ill-treated by the Field Security Police"). And then he adds: "Unter schlagenden Beweisen kam meine erste Vernehmung zustande. Was in dem Protokoll drin steht, weiss ich nicht, obwohl ich es unterschrieben habe. Doch Alkohol und Peitsche waren auch fur mich *zuviel*." ("My first interrogation took place under duress. I do not know what was recorded in the statement, even though I signed it. Because, alcohol and the whip were *too much*, even for me.")

Höss adds that, after being transferred some days later to Minden-on-Weser to the main interrogation center in the British

zone, he was subjected to even more brutal treatment on the part of the British attorney; a major. ("Dort wurde mir noch mehr zugesetz durch den I. englischen Staatsanwalt; einem Major.") He said that the regime of the prison corresponded to the attitude of the Major. For three weeks he was not allowed to wash or shave. For three weeks he was kept in handcuffs. After transfer to Nürnberg, his stay under house arrest had the effect upon him of a stay in a sanitarium; an ideal stay in comparison with what he had experienced. But the interrogations, conducted exclusively by Jews, were terrible, not from a physical, but from a psychological aspect. His interrogators left him in no doubt as to the fate which awaited him, namely in eastern Europe. After his transfer to Poland, he experienced anew more terrible trials, but suddenly the attorney appeared and henceforth Höss was treated with surprisingly kind attention ("anständig und entgegenkommend.") All these details can be found on pages 143-147 of *Kommandant in Auschwitz* (see my note 10 above). What Höss has not mentioned is the result of these physical and spiritual tortures undergone before his delivery to the Poles. On 5 April 1946, ten days before his appearance at the Nürnberg trial, a stupefying affidavit had been extorted from him, which he had signed even though it was not in his mother tongue, but in . . . ENGLISH! It is document PS-3868. Before the Tribunal, on 15 April 1946, American attorney Amen read out the text of the affidavit, in front of Höss. The declarations regarding Auschwitz made a sensation. As for Höss himself, he impressed everyone by his "apathy" (*sic*). His responses were for the most part restricted to a "yes" when Colonel Amen asked him if everything that he had read was accurate. This "apathy" was described by the observers as "schizoid" or an approximation thereof. These observers—all of them antipathetic to Höss—could not imagine how much the adjective "schizoid," which in the mind was insulting, was in fact accurate and reflected a terrible reality, for Höss was in a dual condition; he was "two men at one time," slandered, stupefied, divided into two or nearly so: "schizoid" is an accurate adjective as one could find to describe a man tortured physically and psychologically, and who, as he said in his confession, himself wondered why on earth he had been brought before this formidable tribunal. It is necessary to read the text of the dialog between Colonel Amen and the witness Höss dated 25 April 1946, in volume XI p425ff of the main trial at Nürnberg (IMT). References are to the French edition.

32. Concerning the tortures systematically inflicted by the Americans on their German prisoners, one would to well to refer

to the book by A.R. Butz (*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*) in the passages concerning Justice Gordon Simpson or Judge Charles F. Wennersturm. I also recommend one of the finest books ever written in favor of the rights of man: *Manstein, His Campaign and his Trial* (London, Collins, 1951) by Sir Reginald Paget, and endowed with an outstanding preface by Lord Hankey. On page 109 the author mentions that the American Simpson/Van Roden/Laurenzen commission of inquiry had reported "among other things, that of the 139 cases they had investigated, 137 (German soldiers and officers) had had their testicles permanently destroyed by kicks received from the American War Crimes Investigation team."

33. Dr. Engineer Dürrfeld was the temporary director of the Buna factory at Auschwitz. In document NI-034 Höss was attributed with saying that Dr. Dürrfeld was aware of the gassing of human beings at Birkenau and that he had spoken of it to his colleagues. However in document NI-11046, Dr. Dürrfeld replied: "It is a sorry fact that I heard of (these gassings) first through the radio and through the newspaper reports. I must say that it is a brand of infamy for the German people, that I must say." See also document NI-9542 for Otto Ambros or document NI-11631 for Kurt Rosenbaum. These men confirmed that they had never known anything about the "gassings" despite the fact that they were well placed in order to know everything which took place at Auschwitz. Inmates also had the courage to write that they had never seen any "gas chambers" at Auschwitz or Birkenau, although they were located close to the place where these "chambers" were supposed to be. This is the case for Benedikt Kautsky, the Austrian Social Democrat, of Jewish origin. He lived in various concentration camps, as well as Auschwitz, for nearly seven years. His mother died at Birkenau on 8 December 1944 at the age of 80. In *Teufel und Verdammte (Devil and Damned)* Vienna, Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung (Vienna People's Press), 1948, he writes, (p316), that he has not personally seen those "gas chambers" in the camp. However, this admission does not prevent him from later providing a kind of description of that which he had never seen! He does that on the word of those who "have seen."

34. I make allusion here to certain of the defendants at the Frankfurt Trial (1963-1965); a trial which Hermann Langbein purports to give an account of in his *Der Auschwitz Prozess*, a book which I previously cited in note 9. Franz Hofmann would have employed the expression "assisting to push"; but curiously he

employed the plural: "we have [. . .] pushed together" ("haben wir [. . .] mitgeshoben") (p241). Hans Stark is supposed to have helped a hospital attendant to discharge gas through an aperture in the roof of the "gas chamber"; but Stark is confused, very vague, and the president of the court gives the impression before all of making Stark recite a text (p439).

35. One ought to devote the greatest possible attention to volume 42 which is the last of the volumes of the documents of the International Military Tribunal at Nürnberg. This volume opens with the very long document (153 pages) PS-862. It is a summary presented by the British colonel Airey Neave (who was eventually himself murdered in 1979 by the Irish Republican Army). Neave had been charged with summarizing a host of investigations carried out in Allied prisoner of war camps. He states what is also reported in the document "Politische Leiter 54" (p348): the 26,674 former political directors interrogated have declared that it was only after the capitulation in May 1945 that they first heard of the extermination of the Jews in the camps termed (by the Allies) "extermination camps." ("Sie von einer Vernichtung von Juden in sog. Vernichtungslagern erst nach der Kapitulation in Mai 1945 Kenntnis erhielten.")

36. In private correspondence, Dr. Robert Servatius, who was a defense lawyer at the Nürnberg IMT (1945-1946) and who defended Adolf Eichmann at the "Trial in Jerusalem" (1961), has written to me of "the persons pretended to have been gassed" ("der in Auschwitz angeblich vergasten Personen") in his letter dated 21 June 1974 and of "the pretended gassing" ("der behaupteten Vergasung") in his letter dated 22 February 1975. This world-famous lawyer summarizes in one succinct phrase the reason why German defense counsel take great care not to raise the question of the "gas chambers" before a tribunal: it seems, he says, "that for the defense, the problem of the existence of the gas chambers faded into the background, compared with the question of the participation of their clients in the pretended gassings." ("Anachenend ist die Frage der Existens von Gaskammern für die verteidigen züruckgetreten, gegenüber der Frage der Beteilung ihrer Mandaten an der behauptetn Vergasung.") It cannot be put better. In response to one of my questions about Eichmann, the lawyer specified that Eichmann had declared (to whom? the response is not clear on this point) that he had never seen a gas chamber and that he had never been told about any. (Letter of 22 February 1975.) The stenograph transcripts of the trial (which can

be consulted in several languages at the Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaire in Paris) prove that Eichmann had apparently known nothing about these "gas chambers" except what he had read of them in prison in Höss's "confession" (see the session of 19 April 1961, pages JI-MJ to 02-RM).

37. It was on French television that M. Albert Naud, visibly moved, made this impromtu declaration (Channel 2, "L'huile sur le feu" ("Oil on the Fire") broadcast by Philippe Bouvard, October 1976).

38. This complacent lawyer was Anton Reiners of Frankfurt-am-Main.

39. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Chicago, Quadrangle Books, 1961 & 1967; Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, 2nd edition, London, Vallentine-Mitchell, 1968; H. G. Adler, *Der Verwaltete Mensch*, Tübingen, Mohr (Siebeck), 1974; Hermann Langbein, *Menschen in Auschwitz*, Vienna, Europa Verlag, 1974; Olga Wormser-Migot, *Le Système concentrationaire naze* (1933-1945), Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1968; Serge Klarsfeld, *Le Mémorial de la déportation des Juifs de France*, Klarsfeld Foundation, BP 137-16, 75763 Paris Cedex 16, 1978.

40. Extract from what the Germans call the "Bormann Diaries" ("Bormann Vermercke"). The final part of these "Bormann Diaries" has been published in France under the title of *Le Testament politique de Hitler (The Political Testament of Hitler)*, French version and preface by Francois Genoud, Paris, Arthème Fayard, 1959, pp71-72.

41. "Dass sie deshalb [ihre Konfession] verfolgt worden waren, wie ich glaubte, liess manchmal meine Abneigung gegenüber ungünstigen Aeusserungen über sie fast zum Abscheu werden" (*Mein Kampf (My Struggle)*, Munich, NSDAP, 1942, p55). "Die grossen Meister der Lüge" ("The great masters of the lie"): these are Schopenhauer's words, revived by Hitler (p253 of *Mein Kampf*, *ibid.*).

42. Declaration published in the *Jewish Chronicle*, London, of 8 September 1939, pl.

43. *Daily Express*, London, 24 March 1933, pl.

44. "Nach Beendigung des Krieges werde er [Hitler] sich rigorös auf den Standpunkt stellen, dass er Stadt für Stadt zusammenschlage, venn nicht die Drecksjuden rauskamen und nach Madagaskar oder einem sonstigen judischen Nationalstaat abwandertein." ("After the ending of the war, he [Hitler] would rigorously adopt the standpoint that he would demolish town after town, if the Jewish dregs did not decamp and emigrate to Madagascar or to some other national Jewish homeland.") See Henry Picker, *Hitlers Tischgespräche in Fuhrerhauptquartier (Hitler's Table Talk at the Führer's HQ)*, published by Percy Henry Schramm (. . .), Stuttgart, 1963, p471.

45. Texts and facts abound which prove that the German authorities forbade and punished these excesses, even when Jews were the victims. I will quote only one text and two facts. This text is of General von Roques dated 29 July 1944, on the Russian front (document NOKW-1620). As to facts, they are reported in document NOKW-501. Here is the first fact: in the spring of 1944, at Budapest, a lieutenant killed a Jewess who wished to denounce him for having stolen some of her property, along with some of his men. A German military tribunal condemned the officer to death and he was executed, while several of his men and NCOs were condemned to long terms in prison. Here is the second fact: near to Rostov, USSR, two soldiers were condemned to death by a German military tribunal (and executed?) for having killed the only Jewish inhabitant of a village. One finds these examples and many other facts of the same genre in the 42nd and final volume of the IMT Nürnberg transcripts. Unfortunately, this volume is ignored by just about everyone. It is particularly ignored by the judiciary who permit the invoking of "what happened at Nürnberg' but do not, however, pay sufficient attention to re-reading the actual documentation produced by the CONQUERORS passing judgement on the VANQUISHED. The historian can allow this superficiality even less when he realizes that these same conquerors have committed two very grave injustices: 1. They were the ones who sorted the captured German documents, without allowing any access by the defense; 2. They have selected out of this and other selections when they published the 42 volumes, without including some of the documentary evidence deposited by the defense. It is vitally important to realize that even today—35 years after the war—the Allies still maintain in secret an impressive quantity of German documents, out of which they have already selected those items which, in their eyes, could show Germany in a bad light. Imagine the mountain of "war crimes"

which could be adjudicated with such procedures by an "International Military Tribunal" if it was the CONQUERED being able to judge their CONQUERORS!

But to return to the question of "excesses" or of "war crimes," I would suggest that the German army, and in particular the Waffen-SS, were certainly very tough both in combat and in the "mopping-up" operations against the partisans, but they showed themselves to be in a certain way much less threatening toward civilian non-combatants than other armies. In principle, the more disciplined and controlled an army is, the less the civilian population ought to fear excesses of all kinds. Using this rule of thumb, it would follow that bands of partisans—whatever sympathy can be felt for their cause—are nearly always more of a threat to the civilians.

46. This was described as "Operation Keelhaul." See Julius Epstein, *Operation Keelhaul*, Devin-Adair, 1973; Nikolai Tolstoy, *The Secret Betrayal 1944-1947*, Scribners, 1977; Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, IHR, 1979, pp248-249. The term "keelhaul" speaks for itself; this English verb signifies "inflicting the punishment of hauling the victim from one side to the other of a ship, by causing him to pass under the keel."

47. I must mention that during the same period, and without any military necessity, our American and South African allies rigorously applied segregation against Blacks (which was denounced sometimes in the French "collaborationist" newspapers).

48. Speech made at Posen on 6 October 1943, published on page 169 of *Discours secrets de Heinrich Himmler*, Paris Gallimard, 1978. This is the French translation of "secret" talks from 1933-1945, together with other speeches. The German edition: *Geheimreden 1933 bis 1945 und andere Ansprachen*, *Propylaen geheimreden 1933 bis 1945 und andere Ansprachen*, Propylaen Verlag, 1974. This work should be approached with caution, particularly its French edition.

49. The text of the "Madagaskar Projekt" is little known. It can however be found at the CDJC in Paris. It bears number 172 of the Israeli police (General Headquarters, 6th bureau). It seems that this document was only brought to light in 1961 on the occasion of the Eichmann Trial. It is composed of a letter from Theodor Dannecker, dated 15 August 1940, addressed to Legation Secretary Rademacher, and of the report itself which seems to be, moreover, a

draft unsigned and undated. The reference number at the CDJC is DXII-172.

50. See the letter of reference of Rademacher to ambassador Bielfeld dated 10 February 1942 (document NG-5770).

51. "Total Solution" ("Gesamtlösung") and "Final Solution" ("Endlösung") are the two interchangeable terms employed by Göring in his famous letter of 31 July 1941 addressed to Reinhard Heydrich. The Exterminationists have expatiated interminably upon this very short letter (document PS-710) and, in particular, upon these two words used by Göring. They have all the more speculated on this text since they have—at least for some of them—cynically cut short the first half of his first phrase where a clear and neat explanation is provided of the sense which Göring wished to give to these words. These words in fact imply EMIGRATION or EVACUATION ("Auswanderung oder Evakuirung"). Gerald Reitlinger indulges himself in quoting in full the little letter except for the beginning of it where the reader finds three suspension points instead of "Auswanderung oder Evakuierung"! The reader of Reitlinger thus sees that the beginning of the phrase is missing and he therefore believes that there is certainly nothing important about the absent fragment! It is indeed difficult to act more dishonestly than Reitlinger (see Gerald Reitlinger, *Die Endlösung (The Final Solution)*, translated from English into German by J. W. Brugel, 4th edition revised and corrected, Berlin, Colloquium Verlag, 1961, p92). One will find the text, unmutilated, on page 12 of the remarkable work by Wilhelm Stäglich: *Der Auschwitz Mythos / Legende oder Wirklichkeit (The Auschwitz Myth / Legend or Truth)*, Tübingen, Grabert Verlag, 1979. Wilhelm Stäglich is this former judge at Hamburg who has suffered incessant persecution since 1973 because of his Revisionist convictions.

52. Mention is made of these births in the "Kalendarium" of *Hefte von Auschwitz (Pages of Auschwitz)*, edited by the State Museum at Oswiecim (Auschwitz), in particular in volumes 7 and 8. The Germans maintained a register of all births, including Jews. They kept a record of everything. Every surgical operation, for example, was noted, with the name of the inmate, his registration number, the object and the result of the operation (in Latin), the date, and the signature of the surgeon. At the crematoria, the extraction of a tooth from a corpse was made the object of an incident report ("Meldung"). This last point, on its own, renders absurd the legend of largescale massacres with extraction of teeth on a quasi-industrial scale.

53. I have personally made a thorough inquiry regarding the summary executions carried out by the Resistance in a small region of France. I was surprised to find that the gypsy community has paid a heavy tribute in dead: not as a result of deeds by the Germans, but by the Resistance. This inquiry cannot actually be published in France.

54. On the existence of a vocational school for masons, see for example the evidence of Franz Hofmann in Hermann Langbein's work *Der Auschwitz Prozess*, p236. Concerning the team of apprentices ("Lehrlings-Kommandos) see the evidence of detainee Curt Posener in document NI-9808.

55. Georges Wellers, *l'Etoile jaune à l'heure de Vichy / De Drancy à Auschwitz, (The Yellow Star under the Vichy Era / From Drancy [Transit Camp] to Auschwitz)*, Paris, Fayard 1973, ppV, 4,5,7.

56. The distance from Drancy (near Paris) to Auschwitz (1,250km) was covered, in general, in two days.

57. I can only refer here to the cases of Maurice Bardèche, Paul Rassinier, Manfred Roeder, Thies Christophersen, Wilhelm Stäglich, J.G. Burg (a Jew), Hellmut Diwald, Udo Walendy, Arthur R. Butz, and to my own case. No persecution is overlooked: imprisonment, physical violence, fines, arson, careers destroyed, incredibly unjust legal decisions, pure lies, enforced exile. Not one association defending freedom of expression, not one single group of writers, has raised the least protest at the stupefying proceedings of the Springer group in regard to either David Irving or to the university professor Hellmut Diwald. In this field of persecution, Germany is incontestably to the fore. France occupies second place, and South Africa is not far behind.

58. This decision dates from 17 May 1979 (Bundesprüfstelle für jugendgefährende Schriften ("X-ratings Board") decision No. 2765). The expert selected was the attorney Adalbert Rückerl (the man who said that when one reads "Wolzek" one must understand "Sobibor"; see my footnote 31). The latter was both a judge and judged, since he was devoted his life and certain of his works to defending a thesis (that of Exterminationism) which Dr. Butz considers, like myself, to be erroneous. The text of the judgement is 55 pages long. Within a few years this text may well emerge as a monument to historical inconsistency. The president of the tribunal was Rudolf Stefen. Professor Konrad Jentsch represented Art

("Kunst"); the writer Bernhard Ohsam Literature; Gunther Roland the teachers ("Lehrerschaft"); the prelate Dir Dr. Hermann the Church; etc.

59. *La Guerre Sociale (Class War)*, No. 3, June 1979, pp9-31; BP 88, 75623 Paris Cedex 13. In charge of publication: J. Benhamou.

60. This was my case on 29 January 1978 at the national discussion on "Churches and Christians in France during WWII."

61. Among the 42 columes of the (truncated) accounts of the IMT at Nürnberg, see vol. III, pp574-575 of the French edition, and read document PS-2738 (affidavit of Wilhelm Höttl).

62. Pages 120-122, 125, 128, 136, 141, 149, 157, under the title of "Nahum Goldmann: au nom d'Israël" ("Nahum Goldmann: in the name of Israel"). Nahum Goldmann says that those colossal reparations "constituted an extraordinary innovation in the matter of international rights." They were not in accordance with the German constitution. He dictated his conditions to Adenauer in 1950. He obtained DM 80 billion; that is 10 to 14 times more than the sum he first expected. He says, "Without the German reparations (. . .) the state of Israel would not have the half of its present infrastructure (1978); every train in Israel is German, the ships are German, as well as electricity, a big part of industry . . . without mentioning the individual pensions paid to the survivors (. . . .). In certain years, the amount of the money that Israel received from Germany would exceed the total amount of money collected from international Jewry—multiplying it by two or three times."

The young German taxpayer of 1979, who has no responsibility in the war of 1939-1945, pays of course his share.

The Miracle of Dunkirk Reconsidered

CHARLES LUTTON

Dunkirk: The Patriotic Myth by Nicholas Harmon. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980. 271 pp. with appendices, maps, photographs, annotated bibliography, index. $12.95 ISBN: 0-671-25389-1

Forty one years ago nearly 340,000 British and French troops were evacuated from the besieged port of Dunkirk. At the time the event was portrayed by the British government and press as a kind of victory. The "Spirit of Dunkirk" became a powerful instrument to help sustain morale at home and rally support abroad. Though a number of perceptive military analysts arrived at a more sophisticated understanding of Dunkirk years ago, the war-time version of the event is still repeated, not only in popular literature, but in college texts as well. [1]

Nicholas Harmon, a British journalist and broadcaster, has written a noteworthy study of the Dunkirk episode that goes well beyond previous accounts. In preparing his major revision of Dunkirk, the author consulted Cabinet papers, war diaries, and other newly released documents that had been kept secret for over thirty years under Britain's Official Secrets Act. Harmon had anticipated retelling the familiar story in modern form. But, in light of the previously unavailable records, he found that "as I proceeded the simple truths began to slide away."

Reviewing events from the German invasion of Western Europe on 10 May 1940 to the decision of the British government to withdraw its forces from the continent, Harmon discovered that the long-held assertion that Britain was let down by her French and Belgian allies is a myth. Although the Allies outnumbered their German opponents, including a superiority in tanks, [2] Hitler's generals employed innovative tactics to subdue their more numerous enemies. On 22 May, Churchill's Cabinet decided to retire the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) from France. Anthony Eden formally

ordered the commander of the BEF, General Lord Gort, to deceive his Allies about the British Army's intention to retreat. Churchill contributed to the deception by reassuring French Premier Reynaud that Britain was firmly committed to victory. Even as the British prepared to evacuate, they tried to convince the Belgians to continue to fight. The Belgians did remain on the field of battle for an additional five days, which delayed the advance of German Army Group B toward Dunkirk. As the author points out, "Far from being betrayed by their Allies, the British military commanders in France and Belgium practiced on them a methodical deception which enabled the British to get away with their rear defended."

Harmon's research disclosed that the British were responsible for crimes against both German soldiers and Allied civilians. Some British troops were supplied with dum-dum bullets—lethal missiles expressly banned by the Geneva Convention on the rules of war. London issued directives to take no prisoners except when they specifically needed captive Germans for interrogation. For this reason British Tommies feared being captured because "they supposed that the enemy's orders would be the same as their own." On 27 May, ninety prisoners of the Norfolk Regiment were killed by members of the SS Totendopf Division and on 28 May over eighty men of the Warwickshire Regiment were executed by troops of the SS Adolf Hitler Regiment. These acts were committed in retaliation for the massacre of large numbers of men of the SS Totenkopf Division who had surrendered to the British.

French and Belgian civilians fared little better than the Germans at the hands of their British confederates. Looting was common and "stealing from civilians soon became official policy." British military authorities executed without trial, civilians suspected of disloyalty. In one instance, reports Harmon, the Grenadier Guards shot seventeen suspected "fifth columnists" at Helchin. The perpetrators of these war crimes were apparently not disciplined or placed on trial, as were German soldiers later charged with similar acts.

The evacuation from Dunkirk, codenamed "Operation Dynamo," commenced on 26 May. It was originally hoped that up to 45,000 men might be rescued. The actual total came to 338,000 men.

Lord Gort was instructed not to inform his French and Belgian colleagues that the evacuation was beginning. South-east of Dunkirk the British withdrew their units, leaving seven French divisions alone to face the advancing Germans. The French fought on until their ammunition was exhausted and managed, like the Belgians, to tie down German forces that would otherwise have been available to assault the perimeter of Dunkirk.

As British and French troops retired toward Dunkirk, Admiral Sir B.H. Ramsay organized the sea lift to England. After the French government protested, a written order was issued commanding that French troops be embarked in equal numbers with the British. In practice this was not carried out. Harmon records that when Frenchmen tried to board boats on the beach, Royal Navy shore parties organized squads of soldiers with fixed bayonets to keep them back. On at least one occasion a British platoon fired on French troops attempting to embark. Only after practically all the British had escaped were efforts made to evacuate the remaining French soldiers. But when the port surrendered to the Germans on 3 June, over 40,000 French soldiers were captured.

Perhaps the most memorable aspect of the evacuation was the role played by civilians in their small boats. Harmon explains that this is just part of the myth. The British public was not informed that an evacuation was underway until 6pm on 31 May. A Small Vessels Pool, based on Sheerness, did assemble a large number of small civilian craft. But most of them were useless for evacuation work. Only on the last two days of the withdrawal did civilian volunteers play a role in rescuing an additional 26,500 men from the beaches. Their contribution, notes the author, "was gallant and distinguished; but it was not significant in terms of numbers rescued."

Harmon re-examined the on-going controversy concerning Hitler's order of 24 May, halting for two days the German advance in the direction of Dunkirk. After the war some German officers claimed that they were "shocked" when they received the order to stop their tanks at the river Aa, which permitted the French to establish a defensive line on the west side of Dunkirk. At the time, however, Panzer General Heinz Guderian visited his leading units on the approaches to Dunkirk and concluded that General Von

Rundstedt had been right to order a halt and that further tank attacks across the wet land (which had been reclaimed from the sea) would have involved a useless sacrifice of some of his best troops. In his post-war memoirs and discussions with Sir Basil Liddell Hart, Guderian tried to blame Hitler for the suspension of the advance. From his discussions with Guderian and other German generals, Liddell Hart concluded that Hitler permitted the British Army to escape on purpose, hoping that this generous act would facilitate the conclusion of peace with Britain. [3]

A number of years ago it became clear that the order to stop the advance of the German Panzer units had been expected for some time. General Von Rundstedt finally issued that order on 24 May which Hitler simply confirmed.[4] The troops were allowed to rest and local repairs were carried out on the armored vehicles. When the offensive resumed on 26 May the German priorities had shifted and the focus of the attack was Paris and the heartland of the country where a large body of French troops remained. Dunkirk was regarded as a sideshow. German Air Force units were assigned to bombard Dunkirk, but the weather there was generally unsuitable for flying and during the nine days of the evacuation the Luftwaffe interfered with it only two-and-a-half days—27 May the afternoon of 29 May and on 1 June.[5]

While the author has written a solid re-appraisal of Dunkirk, he is less trustworthy when he wanders from his topic. For instance, early in his narrative Harmon repeats the old fable that pre-war German re-armament "was the motor of the country's economic recovery in the 1930's." Later on, he states that "in conspiracy with the German dictatorship, the Soviet dictatorship swallowed up Finland" (*sic*). A good editor should have caught this error.

Nicholas Harmon's study shows that an event which has long been celebrated as one of the greatest triumphs in British history, was, in fact, a major defeat. The evacuation of a third of a million men was a unique achievement, but a military catastrophe nonetheless. In de-mythologizing Dunkirk, he has made a contribution to our understanding of the Second World War.

* * * *

Notes

1. In 1948 the outstanding British military theorist and historian, Major General J.F.C. Fuller, exploded the Dunkirk myth in his book, *The Second World War: A Strategical and Tactical History* (Duell, Sloan & Pearce). Yet years later, University of Illinois professor David Sumler wrote, "At the port of Dunkirk, all sorts of civilian crafts mobilized by the British government—fishing boats, yachts, tug boats—braved the bombs and strafing runs of the Luftwaffe to rescue 200,000 British and 140,000 French troops." *A History of Europe in the Twentieth Century* (The Dorsey Press, 1973) p234.

2. One of the most enduring legends of the war is belief that the German armies of 1939-41 were highly mechanized. In 1940 the Germans deployed only ten armored (Panzer) divisions out of 135 assembled for the Western offensive. The Anglo-French forces not only possessed more tanks than the Germans, but a higher percentage of their tanks were medium and heavy models. Most of the tanks used by the Germans in 1940 were obsolescent light Mark Is and IIs, augmented by several hundred Czech light tanks.

3. This thesis first appeared in B.H. Liddell Hart's 1948 book, *The German Generals Talk* (British title: *The Other Side of the Hill*). The volume has recently been reprinted in paperback by William Morrow & Co. Years later he modified his views on this matter, remarking that Hitler's "decision was woven of several threads." He said that General Blumentritt, Rundstedt's ex-Chief-of-Staff, had told him that "the 'halt' had been called for more than military reasons, and that it was part of a political scheme to make peace easier to reach. If the BEF had been captured at Dunkirk, the British might have felt that their honor had suffered a stain which they must wipe out. By letting it escape Hitler hoped to conciliate them." B.H. Liddell Hart, *History of the Second World War* (G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1970) pp74-5, 77, 80-3.

4. Maj. Gen. J.F.C. Fuller, in his concise and perceptive review of the military questions involved, pointed out that Rundstedt first ordered Hoth's and Kleist's Panzer Groups to temporarily halt on the evening of 23 May. "In the circumstances this was a sound decision. The German armored divisions needed rest and an overhaul. . . The truth is, that the whole area was one vast tank obstacle, and that Hitler, who had a better understanding of the capability of tanks than most of his generals, considered their use in the Dunkirk area *would be* an 'incredible blunder'. . . The evacuation was a phenomenal success, as so many British retreats have been. . . The causes of the success were outside German control." Fuller, *A Military History of the Western World, Vol III: From the Seven Days Battle, 1862, to the Battle of Leyte Gulf, 1944* (Minerva Press, 1967) pp400-404.

Another British observer, Alistair Horne, has written: "Three myths can be usefully dispatched. . . Thirdly, the fault for the 'Halt Order' cannot be placed solely at Hitler's door. Since the war, German generaldom has been committed for various reasons, which include both self-preservation and professional pride, to blaming every war-time error and crime upon Hitler. . . But if anyone was primarily to blame, both on the evidence of the episode itself and of his past performance during the campaign, it was Rundstedt. . . He was an outstanding battle commander, but as a strategist he showed himself throughout to be almost as preconditioned by the experiences of the First World War as his French counterparts. On 24 May, it was the shock of what the British *had done* (in their brief offensive at Arras on 21 May) coupled with his ineradicable fears of what the French still *could do*, which principally decided Rundstedt, and, through him persuaded Hitler, to halt the Panzers." Horne, *To Lose A Battle: France 1940* (pb. ed. pp602-03. Penguin Books, 1979, $5.95, ISBN: 0-14-00-50426).

5. Cajus Bekker, *The Luftwaffe War Diaries*, pb. ed. pp162-175. Translated by Frank Ziegler (Ballantine Books, 1980, $3.95. ISBN: 0-345-28799-1). This book was first published in Germany in 1964. Though far from definitive, it remains the best history available of the German air force in World War II.

Bombs on Britain

Dr. A.R. WESSERLE

PBS Television
"The Blitz"

16 March 1981

Sirs:

Rarely have I come across a television broadcast more vicious in intent and more warped in execution than your recent "Blitz on Britain." As a survivor of the mass air raid executed against my native city of Prague, Bohemia, on the Christian Holy Day of Palm Sunday, 1945, by the Anglo-American strategic bomber force—a raid that maimed or murdered thousands a few seconds before the conclusion of the Second World War—I say this:

1. There can be no comparison between the brutality of the Anglo-American bomber offensive, on one hand, and the minimality of the German-Italian efforts, on the other.

As the commander of the British strategic air offensive, Air Marshal Sir Arthur Harris shows in his *Bomber Offensive* (Macmillan, New York, 1947) 23 German cities had more than 60 percent of thier built-up area destroyed; 46 had half of it destroyed. 31 communities had more than 500 acres obliterated: Berlin, 6427 acres: Hamburg, 6200 acres; Duesseldorf, 2003; Cologne (through air attack), 1994. *By contrast*, the three favorite targets of the Luftwaffe: London, Plymouth and Coventry, had 600 acres, 400, and just over 100 acres destroyed.

2. Anglo-American strategic bombers, according to official sources of the West German government in 1962, dropped 2,690,000 metric tons of bombs on Continental Europe; 1,350,000 tons were dropped on Germany within its 1937 boundaries; 180,000 tons on Austria and the Balkans; 590,000 tons on France; 370,000 tons on Italy; and 200,000 tons on miscellaneous targets such as Bohemia, Slovakia

and Poland. *By contrast*, Germany dropped a total of 74,172 tons of bombs as well as V-1 and V-2 rockets and "buzz bombs" on Britain—five percent of what the Anglo-Saxons rained down on Germany.

The Federal German Government has established the minimum count—not an estimate—of 635,000 German civilians were killed in France, Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Czecheslovakia, and elsewhere.

3. Both Germany and Britain initiated air raids on naval and military targets as of 3 September 1939. However, when the British attacks on port installations in Northern Germany ended in disaster, with a devastating majority of bombers downed—the Battle of the German Bight—Britain switched over to less costly night air raids on civilian targets such as Berlin and the Ruhr industrial region. *By contrast*, Germany replied in kind only in the winter months of 1940/41, a year later.

Observers indubitably British, such as the late Labour Minister Crossman, the scientist and writer C.P. Snow, and the Earl of Birkenhead, have demonstrated that it was not Germany but Britain that, after May, 1940, unleashed an official policy of unrestricted and unlimited raids on civilian populations under its new Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, and his science advisor, Dr. Lindemann. Professor Lindemann, the later Viscount Cherwell, coolly calculated that, by using a force of 10,000 heavy bombers to attack and destroy the 58 largest German cities, one-third of the population of Germany would be "de-housed." The assumption, of course, also was that out of those 25-27 million homeless at least ten percent—2.5 to 3 million people—would be killed. On this score alone, Winston Churchill and his advisors deserve to rank among the maddest mass murderers in history. In fact, as West German records show, 131 German towns were hit by heavy strategic raids. Only the courage of the Luftwaffe pilots, the effectiveness of the air defense network and the strength of the fire fighting organization worked together to prevent a bloodbath to the extent envisioned by the Prime Minister.

4. Blood baths did occur when conditions were right.

When the Anglo-American bombing policy reached its first grand climax in a raid on Hamburg that stretched over several days and nights in July, 1943, a minimum of 40,000 to 50,000 civilians burned to death.

With the defensive power of the Reich worn down in the second half of 1944 and in 1945, the Anglo-Saxons indulged in ever more massive extermination raids against Europe. Communities of little or no military value, even if attacked previously, were now pulverized, preferably under conditions of the utmost horror. Christian holy days, and dates and sites of famous art festivals were select occasions for raids. Many of the most beautiful cities of Europe and the world were systematically pounded into nothingness, often during the last weeks of the war, among them: Wuerzburg, Hildesheim, Darmstadt, Kassel, Nürnberg, Braunschweig. Little Pforzheim in south-west Germany had 17,000 people killed. Dresden, one of the great art centers and in 1945 a refuge for perhaps a million civilians, was decimated with the loss of at least 100,000 souls. Europe from Monte Cassino to Luebeck and Rostock on the Baltic, from Caen and Lisieux in France to Pilsen, Prague, Bruenn, Budapest and Bucharest reeled under the barbaric blows of the bombers.

5. Nor did the extermination raids stop with Europe.

Cigar-chomping General Curtis LeMay demonstrated in the Far East that record kills could be achieved without resort to atomic weapons. By applying the lessons learned in Europe to the wooden architecture of the Asian mainland and Japan he raised "fire storms" which surpassed even those of Hamburg, Pforzheim and Dresden. Mass raids by superheavy B-29 bombers against Osaka, Nagoya, Kobe and particularly, Tokyo-Yokohama, resulted in a minimum harvest of 125,000 to 150,000 kills per raid. More than 1.2 million Japanese civilians were killed through bombing. Millions of others fell victim to it, from Mukden, Manchuria, to Rangoon, Burma.

It goes without saying that LeMay and his colleagues could not have carried out their compaigns of mass annihilation without the backing of the highest political leaders in the land. In fact, the United States Government had placed orders for the immediate development of four-engined, superheavy, very-long-range bombers (the XB 15, the B-17, the XB 19, the B-24 and the B-29) starting in 1934.

Thus, the Roosevelt Administration had begun to lay plans for offensive, strategic, global war back in 1933, the year of its inception. With the later exception of Britain, none of the other "large" powers followed suit: neither

France, Italy and Germany, nor Soviet Russia and Japan—the latter with extensive holdings in the Pacific.

These are sobering facts. PBS, with its record of fine programming, has much to lose if it insists on presenting biassed reports such as "Blitz on Britain" or "UXB." If you care to tap the unplumbed depths of sentimentality, envy and hatred, start a comic strip. In the meantime, we'll change channels.

Give poor Alistair Cooke, who has been mightily discomfited of late, a much-needed respite.

Sincerely,
Dr. A.R. Wesserle

About the Contributors

PAUL RASSINIER was born into a farming family in France in 1906. He was formally schooled in the area of his childhood, eventually passing the necessary examinations allowing him to teach as a professor of history and geography. He joined the Socialist Party (SFIO) in 1934 and became involved with the Resistance when the war broke out in 1939. Eventually he was arrested by the Gestapo and deported to Buchenwald. Later, he was moved to camp Dora where he was incarcerated until the war's end, at which time he returned to France where he was decorated for his Resistance activities and elected to the *Assemblee Nationale* as a socialist deputy. Professor Rassinier, some of whose writings have been translated into English—*Debunking the Genocide Myth* and *The Real Eichmann Trial*—died in 1967 at his home in Paris-Asnieres.

DR. ROBERT FAURISSON was born at Shepperton, near London, in 1929, to a French father and a Scottish mother. He was educated in Singapore, Japan, Marseilles, and in Paris at the Sorbonne, where he received his doctorate in 1972. After a short spell teaching at the Sorbonne, Professor Faurisson became Associate Professor in French Literature at the University of Lyon-2 in central France. He specializes in the appraisal and evaluation of texts and documents.

DR. ANDREAS R. WESSERLE was born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, into a German-Hungarian family. He was raised in Bohemia and Moravia, but later emigrated to the U.S.A. He received his BS in Sociology, and an MA in Political Science from Marquette University. He later received an MA in Political Sociology and Urban Affairs at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He gained his Ph.D. in Government and Urban Planning at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. He is a member of several national honor societies, and received a Fulbright return fellowship in 1968. Having worked at the Institute for German Affairs at Marquette University from 1965 to 1966, he has also taught Sociology and Political Science at two large state universities and at three Catholic colleges in the mid-West and East.

PHILIP BECK recently retired as editor of the oldest continuously published newspaper in the world, *Berrow's Worcester Journal* (founded 1690). Lately, he has been investigating certain little-known aspects of the Second World War and among his published works is *Oradour, Village of the Dead*, an investigation into the massacre by the SS of the entire population of a village near Limoges, France. He has recently completed a book about the destruction of Saint Malo, Brittany, of which his article is a condensation, and is currently engaged on a novel which features the hangings at Tulle, southern France. He has a French wife and both are bi-lingual. He lives in the Vale of Evesham, near Stratford-on-Avon.

CHARLES LUTTON teaches history at The Summit College, in Colorado. He is a member of the American Committee on the History of the Second World War.